

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
DEPARTMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGY
CENTRAL ARCHÆOLOGICAL
LIBRARY

CALL No. 891.05 / J.A.O.S
ACC. No. 24560

D.G.A. 79.

GIPN—S1—2D. G. Arch.N. D./57—25-9-58—1,00,000

JOURNAL
OF THE
AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY

EDITED BY

MAX L. MARGOLIS
Dropsie College

FRANKLIN EDGERTON
Yale University

W. NORMAN BROWN
University of Pennsylvania

24560

VOLUME 49

891.05

J. A. O. S.

PUBLISHED BY THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY

ADDRESS, CARE OF

YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS

NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT, U. S. A.

1929

CENTRAL ARCHIVES
LIBRARY, NEW HAVEN, CT.

Acc. No. 24560

Date 20 10 56

Call No. 8.9.1.0.5. / J. A. 0.5

A copy of this volume, postage paid, may be obtained anywhere within the limits of the Universal Postal Union, by sending a Postal Money Order for six dollars, or its equivalent, to The YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS, New Haven, Connecticut, United States of America.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ALLEN, T. GEORGE: "Independent" Uses of the Egyptian Qualitative,	160
BARTON, GEORGE A.: Whence Came the Sumerians?	263
COOMARASWAMY, A. K.: A Passage in the <i>Uttara-Rāma-Carita</i> of <i>Bhavabhūti</i>	61
——— Review of Śāstri's <i>Samarāṅganasūtradhāra</i>	69
——— Review of Bose's <i>Principles of Indian Śilpaśāstra</i>	69
——— Review of Longhurst's <i>Pallava Architecture</i>	70
——— Review of Sastri's <i>Two Statues of Pallava Kings and Five Pallava Inscriptions in a Rock Temple at Mamallapuram</i>	70
——— Review of Aiyangar's <i>Manimekhatal in its Historical Setting</i> ,	71
——— Review of Gangoly's <i>Masterpieces of Rajput Painting</i>	72
——— Review of Marchal's <i>Costumes et parures khmers d'après les Devatā d'Angkor Vat</i>	73
——— Review of Marchal's <i>Dances cambodgiennes</i>	73
——— Review of Vogel's <i>Indian Serpent Lore</i>	186
——— Review of Hürliman's <i>India: the Landscape, the Monuments, and the People</i>	190
——— Review of Banerji's <i>Basreliefs of Bādāmi</i>	191
——— Review of Binyon's <i>The Poems of Nizami</i>	329
——— Review of Stern's <i>Le Bayon d'Angkor et l'évolution de l'art khmer</i>	330
——— Review of Cousens's <i>Chalukyan Architecture</i>	331
DANTON, G. H.: Review of Escarra and Germain's <i>Leang K'i-Tch'ao, La Conception de la Loi et les Théories des Légistes à la veille de Ts'in</i>	76
EDGEERTON, FRANKLIN: Review of LeCoq and Waldschmidt's <i>Die budd- histische Spätantike in Mittelasien</i>	62
——— Review of Renou's <i>La valeur du parfait dans les hymnes védiques</i>	64
——— Review of Krishnamacharya's <i>Tattvasaṃgraha of Śāntarākṣita, with the Commentary of Kamalaśīla</i>	66
——— Review of Lādhāji's <i>Syādvādamañjari</i>	67
——— The Upaniṣads: What do They Seek, and Why?	97
——— Review of Wüst's <i>Stilgeschichte und Chronologie des Rgveda</i> ,	276
——— Review of Sukthankar's <i>The Mahābhārata</i>	282
EITAN, ISRAEL: Two Onomatological Notes	30
GORDON, CYRUS H.: The Feminine Singulars of the Egyptian Demon- strative Pronouns	58
GOTTHEIL, RICHARD J. H.: A Further Fragment on Astrology from the Genizah	291
HALL, H. U.: Review of Armstrong's <i>Rossel Island</i>	182

	PAGE
HIRSCHFELD, HARTWIG: A Hebraeo-Sufic Poem	168
HITTI, PHILIP K.: Review of Sa'd, Erdman, and Khayrallah's <i>Al-Mu'jam al-'Aşri fi al-Inkilizi w-al-'Arabi</i> ; al-Maqdisi's <i>Al-Dhikra</i> ; Qurbān's <i>Al-'Uşūr al-Qadimah</i>	85
—— Review of <i>Al-Rūwād (The Pioneers)</i>	327
—— Review of Van Hoesen and Walker's <i>Bibliography: Enumerative and Historical</i>	327
—— Review of Feghali's <i>Syntaxe des parlers arabes actuels du Liban</i>	328
HOPKINS, E. WASHBURN: A Handful of Books from India	52
—— Reviews of Lévi's <i>L'Inde et le monde</i> , Law's <i>Ancient Indian Tribes</i> , Hertel's <i>Die Arische Feuerlehre</i> and <i>Die Methode der Arischen Forschung</i>	177
JACKSON, A. V. WILLIAMS: On Turfan Pahlavi <i>miyazdagtāčih</i> , as designating a Manichaean Ceremonial Offering	34
LAUFER, BERTHOLD: On the Possible Oriental Origin of our Word <i>Booze</i>	56
KENT, ROLAND G.: Review of Lokotsch's <i>Etymologisches Wörterbuch der europäischen Wörter orientalischen Ursprungs</i>	93
—— Review of Jackson's <i>Zoroastrian Studies</i>	286
KRAELING, C. H.: The Origin and Antiquity of the Mandeans	195
K'UEI-YUEN, HUANG and SHRYOCK, J. K.: A Collection of Chinese Prayers	128
LEON, HARRY J.: The Synagogue of the Herodians	318
MALONE, CARROLL B.: Current Regulations for Building and Furnishing Chinese Imperial Palaces, 1727-1750	234
MARGOLIS, MAX L.: Review of Montgomery's <i>A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel</i>	78
—— Review of Blondheim's <i>Les parlers judéo-romans et la Vetus Latina</i>	82
MARTINOVITCH, N.: Review of <i>Iran</i> , Vol. I, 1926	91
—— Review of <i>Mir 'Alī Shir</i>	185
—— Arabic, Persian and Turkish Manuscripts in the Columbia University Library	219
MAYNARD, J. A.: Review of Barton's <i>Archaeology and the Bible</i>	182
MEEK, THEOPHILE JAMES: The Co-ordinate Adverbial Clause in Hebrew	156
MONTGOMERY, JAMES A.: Review of Mingana's <i>Woodbrooke Studies</i>	284
PFEIFFER, ROBERT H.: Review of Chiera's <i>Joint Expedition with the Irak Museum at Nuzi</i>	178
POPICHA, JOSEPH: The Biblical Nimrod and the Kingdom of Eanna	303
PRICE, IRA M.: The Oath in Court Procedure in Early Babylonia and the Old Testament	22
SAUNDERS, VIRGINIA: Review of Sarup's <i>The Vision of Vāsavadattā</i> ,	74
—— Review of Chattopādhyāya's <i>The Date of Kalidāsa</i>	75
SHRYOCK, J. K.: Review of Dubs's <i>Hsuntze; the Moulder of Ancient Confucianism</i>	88
—— and K'UEI-YUEN, HUANG: A Collection of Chinese Prayers	128

	PAGE
SMITH, MARIA WILKINS: Review of Pavry's <i>Iranian Studies</i> . . .	174
SPEISER, E. A.: Review of Worrell's <i>A Study of Races in the Ancient Near East</i>	181
——— Review of David's <i>Die Adoption im altbabylonischen Recht</i> . .	182
——— A Letter of Saushshatar and the Date of the Kirkuk Tablets . .	269
——— Review of Gadd and Legrain's <i>Ur Excavations, Texts, I: Royal Inscriptions</i>	322
——— Review of Contenau's <i>Manuel d'archéologie orientale</i> . . .	323
——— Review of Bauer's <i>Die Ostkanaanäer</i>	325
STEPHENS, FERRIS J.: Did the Early Semites of Asia Minor Use the Alphabet?	122
TUTTLE, EDWIN H.: Dravidian <i>*geli</i> and Aryan <i>*gili</i>	60
VANOVERBERG, MORICE: Iloko Anatomy,	1
——— Iloko Pathology	244
WARE, JAMES R.: Studies in the Divyāvadāna, II	40

LIST OF BOOKS REVIEWED

AIYANGAR, S. KRISHNASWAMI: Manimekhalai in its Historical Setting (A. K. Coomaraswamy)	71
AL-RŪWĀD (The Pioneers) (Philip K. Hitti)	327
ARMSTRONG, W. A.: Rossel Island: An Ethnological Study (H. U. Hall)	182
BANERJĪ, R. D.: Basreliefs of Bādāmī (A. K. Coomaraswamy) . .	191
BARTON, GEORGE A.: Archaeology and the Bible (J. A. Maynard) .	182
BAUER, THEO: Die Ostkanaanäer (E. A. Speiser)	325
BINYON, LAURENCE: The Poems of Nizami (A. K. Coomaraswamy) .	329
BLONDHEIM, D. H.: Les parlers judéo-romans et la Vetus Latina (Max L. Margolis)	82
BOSE, P. N.: Principles of Indian Śilpasastra; with the text of Mayaśāstra (A. K. Coomaraswamy)	69
CHATTOPĀDHYĀYA, KSHETREŚACHANDRA: The Date of Kālidāsa (Virginia Saunders)	75
CHIERA, EDWARD: Joint Expedition with the Irak Museum at Nuzi (Robert H. Pfeiffer)	180
CONTENAU, G.: Manuel d'archéologie orientale (E. A. Speiser) . .	323
COUSENS, H.: Chalukyan Architecture (A. K. Coomaraswamy) . .	331
DUBS, H. H.: Hsuntze, the Moulder of Ancient Confucianism (J. K. Shryock)	88
ESCARRA, JEAN-GERMAIN, ROBERT: Leang K'i-Tch'ao, La Conception de la Loi et les Théories des Légistes à la veille de Ts'in (G. H. Danton)	76
FEGHALI, MICHEL: Syntaxe des parlers arabes actuels du Liban (Philip K. Hitti)	328
GADD, C. J.—LEGRAIN, LEON: Ur Excavations, Texts, I: Royal Inscriptions (G. A. Speiser)	322
GANGOLY, O. C.: Masterpieces of Rajput Painting (A. K. Coomaraswamy)	72

	PAGE
HEETEL, JOHANNES: Die Arische Feuerlehre (E. Washburn Hopkins)	177
—— Die Methode der Arischen Forschung (E. Washburn Hopkins)	177
HÖGMAN, C. A.: L'Inde et son âme	95
HÜRLIMAN, MARTIN: India: the Landscape, the Monuments, and the People (A. K. Coomaraswamy)	190
IRAN, Vol. I, 1926 (N. Martinovitch)	91
JACKSON, A. V. WILLIAMS: Zoroastrian Studies: the Iranian Reli- gion and Various Monographs (Roland G. Kent)	286
KRISHNAMACHARYA, EMBAR: Tattvasaṃgraha of śāntarākṣita, with the Commentary of Kamalaśīla (F. Edgerton)	66
LĀDHĀJĪ: Syādvādamāñjarī (F. Edgerton)	67
LAW, B. C.: Ancient Indian Tribes (E. Washburn Hopkins)	177
LECOQ, A. VON-WALDSCHMIDT, E.: Die buddhistische Spätantike in Mittelasien (F. Edgerton)	62
LÉVI, SYLVAIN: L'Inde et la monde (E. Washburn Hopkins)	177
LOKOTSCH, KARL: Etymologisches Wörterbuch der europäischen (ger- manischen, romanischen und slavischen) Wörter orientalischen Ursprungs (Roland G. Kent)	93
LONGHURST, A. H.: Pallava Architecture (A. K. Coomaraswamy)	70
AL-MAQDISI, ANIS KHŪRĪ: Al-Dhikra (Philip K. Hitti)	85
MARCHAL, SAPPHO: Costumes et parures khmèrs d'après les Devatā d'Angkor (A. K. Coomaraswamy)	73
—— Dances cambodgiennes (A. K. Coomaraswamy)	73
MINGANA, A.: Woodbrooke Studies: Christian Documents in Syriac, Arabic and Garshūni (James A. Montgomery)	284
MIR 'ALĪ SHĪR. The volume in commemoration of the 500 anniver- sary of his birth (N. Martinovitch)	185
MONTGOMERY, JAMES A.: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel (Max L. Margolis)	78
PAVRY, C. E.: Iranian Studies (Maria W. Smith)	174
QURBAN, DAWUD: Al-'Uṣūr al-Qadīmah (Philip K. Hitti)	85
RENOU, LOUIS: La valeur du parfait dans les hymnes védiques (F. Edgerton)	64
SA'D, K., ERDMAN, P., KHAYBALLAH, A.: Al-Mu'jam al-'Aṣri fi al- Inkilizi w-al-'Arabi (Philip K. Hitti)	85
SARUP, LAKSHMAN: The Vision of Vāsavadattā (Virginia Saunders)	74
ŚĀSTRĪ, GANAPATI: Samarāṅganasūtradhāra (A. K. Coomaraswamy)	69
SASTRI, H. K.: Two Statues of Pallava Kings and Five Pallava In- scriptions in a Rock Temple at Mamallapuram (A. K. Cooma- raswamy)	70
STERN, PHILIPPE: Le Bayon d'Angkor et l'évolution de l'art khmer (A. K. Coomaraswamy)	330
SUKTHANKAR, VISHNU S.: The Mahābhārata (F. Edgerton)	282
VAN HOESEN, H. B.-WALKER, F. K.: Bibliography: Enumerative and Historical (Philip K. Hitti)	327
VOGEL, J. PH.: Indian Serpent Lore, or the Nāgas in Hindu Legend and Art (A. K. Coomaraswamy)	186

	PAGE
WORRELL, WILLIAM H.: A Study of Races in the Ancient Near East (E. A. Speiser)	182
WÜST, WALTHER: Stilgeschichte und Chronologie des R̥gveda (F. Edgerton)	276

NOTES OF THE SOCIETY	96, 193, 289, 332
NOTES OF OTHER SOCIETIES	289
PERSONALIA,	96, 289
ANNOUNCEMENTS	289
PROCEEDINGS OF THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY	333
PROCEEDINGS OF THE MIDDLE WEST BRANCH	364
LIST OF MEMBERS	371

ILLUSTRATIONS

A Manichaeian Ceremonial Offering	opposite 37
śeṣa nāga, Śrīśailam, ca. 16th century	opposite 189
<i>Ahigunḍika Jātaka</i> (?), Amarāvati	opposite 189
A nāga Jātaka, Amarāvati	opposite 189
Facsimiles of Astrological Text	opposite 292

16. 12. 19

ILOKO ANATOMY

MORICE VANOVERBERG, C. I. C. M.

KABUGAW-APAYAW, MOUNTAIN PROVINCE, P. I.

IN TWO PREVIOUS PAPERS, published in the JOURNAL 47. 133-173 and 48. 1-33, we described the different kinds of plants and animals, whose Iloko names had come to our notice.

In this paper we shall try to give the names of the different parts of men, animals and plants, as known by the Iloko.

We shall avoid as much as possible all words that are obviously Spanish.

The first section will deal with the different parts of the human body. In the second section we shall give the names applied exclusively to parts of animals. In the third section Plant Anatomy will be considered.

Whenever a term is common either to all three, i. e. men, animals and plants, or to only two of them, the same will be described once for all under the first section, if it can be applied to men, under the second, if it cannot be applied to men.

I. MEN.

abága: shoulder.

agónṅ: nose.

ákat: the adipose tissue, muscles, etc., that are situated between the branches of the lower jaw, under the chin, e. g. the mylohyoid, etc.; double chin or buccula. Cfr. (*da*)*davis(an)*.

(*ak*-)*akló* or (*aklo*)*akló*: shoulder blade or scapula. *Akló* means "ladle"; the reduplications indicate resemblance.

alipuspús: whirl (in the hair).

aliwadánṅ: collar bone or clavicle.

(*al*-)*aluttit*: the temporary protuberance resulting from external stimulation of muscles. This is especially apparent on the biceps flexor cubiti, when struck horizontally with a sharp blow, or pinched broadly with an outward movement and then released at once. *Aluttit* means "lizard"; the reduplication indicates resemblance.

alut-út(an): the section of the head situated immediately above the ear, and corresponding to the auricularis superior. *Alut-út* means "pulling toward oneself," e. g. vines, nets, etc.; the suffix is a locative.

ambús: pudendum of girls under seven years of age. This term is rarely used. Cfr. *óki*.

ámil: the mucous membrane of the upper lip. *Amil* also means "licking the lips."

ammútil: Adam's apple; nipple, mamilla or teat; the tip or top of the banana (fruit), etc.

(*am-*)*ammútil*: ensiform process, ensiform cartilage, ensiform appendix, xiphoid process, xiphoid cartilage, xiphoid appendix, xiphoid appendage or xiphisternum. Cfr. *ammútil*; the reduplication indicates resemblance.

(*a*)*anak(án)*: womb, uterus or matrix. *Anák* means child; the suffix is a locative; the reduplication emphasizes the meaning. Consequently *aanakán* means literally "the ordinary place of the child."

(*a*)*añót(an)*: pituitary membrane or olfactory mucous membrane. The same term is sometimes applied to the nasal cavities. *Añót* means "smelling"; the suffix is a locative; the reduplication emphasizes the meaning. Consequently *aañótan* means literally "the ordinary place of smell."

(*añg-*)*añgyób*: windpipe, trachea or weasand. *Añgyób* means "blow-pipe"; the reduplication indicates resemblance.

apró: bile or gall.

(*in-in*)*apúy*: the depression produced in the cheek by gaping. *Inapúy* means "cooked rice" (from *apúy*, fire, and the infix *in*, which is the past form of the suffix *en* of transitive verbs, and which forms past participles); the reduplication indicates resemblance.

(*imm*)*arág(an)*: undulate or wavy (hair). *Arágan* is the name of a kind of seaweed or alga; the infix *imm* is the past form of the infix *um*, which forms intransitive verbs and adds the notion of growing, becoming, to the meaning of the stem.

arimonǵámonǵ: the adipose tissue that cleaves to the small intestine. *Arimonǵámonǵ* also means "crossroads."

aripúyot: gluteus maximus, the largest muscle of the buttocks.

aripúyot ti takkiág: biceps flexor cubiti, biceps brachii or biceps humeri, the large flexor muscle of the front of the upper arm. Literally: *aripúyot* of the arm.

(*a*)*ayús(an)*: the part of the upper lip situated immediately below a nasal cavity; it corresponds to the course of the nasal mucus from the point where it emerges from the nose downwards. *Ayus* means "lowing"; the suffix is a locative; the reduplication emphasizes the meaning.

bagí: body. This term is sometimes used to indicate the genitals, but in this case the context must clearly show its meaning.

bágis: intestine or bowel; gut, catgut.

b(in)akláy: areola, the colored ring around the nipple, especially when swollen. *Bakláy* means "carrying on the shoulders"; the infix *in* is the past form of the suffix *en* of transitive verbs and it forms past participles.

bakránǵ: side, i. e. the part of the side that faces the upper arm; it extends from the armpit to the waist.

(*bañga*)*bánǵa*: skull. *Bánǵa* is the name of a kind of round, almost

spherical earthen jar; the reduplication indicates resemblance. Cfr. (*sabot*) *sabót*.

barú: lung.

barúwas: any of the twelve principal bones of arms and legs: humerus (two), ulna, cubit or cubitus (two), radius (two), femur or thigh bone (two), tibia or shin bone (two), fibula (two).

bariñggáwid: fraenum or frenum, binding down the under side of the tongue. Cfr. *biríñg* and *kambiñg*.

barúkoñg: chest, breast or bosom.

basisaw: urinary bladder or bladder.

bekkél: kidney. *Bekkél* also means "strangling."

(*be*) *bekkel(án)*: the part of the windpipe situated in the throat (the part of the neck front of the vertebral column). *Bekkél* means "strangling"; the suffix is a locative; the reduplication emphasizes the meaning.

benñggás: Cfr. *biñggás*.

(*be*) *bessañg(án)*: Achilles' tendon or hamstring (in animals). *Bessañg* means "gap or mountain pass," and "cutting the Achilles' tendon or hamstring" (in animals); the suffix is a locative; the reduplication emphasizes the meaning.

bibíng: lip; more especially: underlip. Cfr. *ñgíwñgíw*.

biñggás: fiber or fibre; grain; white vein or streak (of the betel nut).

biríñg: nasal septum; fraenum or frenum. Cfr. *bariñggáwid* and *kambiñg*. *Biríñg* also means "fastening."

bisñgáy: parting (of the hair).

bitaél: a piece of round, hard, adipose tissue, situated near the stomach, and aching in travelling women.

bitúka: stomach.

bokó: knuckle, the rounded prominence formed by the ends of the two adjacent bones of a joint in fingers or toes; node (of bamboo, etc.).

boksít: abdomen or belly; more especially: the umbilical region.

boñgkatól: any hard protuberance, whether bony or fatty.

boñgkól: the part of any large bone (humerus, femur, etc.) consisting of the head and a part of the shaft.

boók: hair (of the head). Cfr. *dutdút*.

bóto: penis or male member; style (of the pistil).

botóy: calf (of the leg). Cfr. *lúlod*.

bugagáw: blue, gray (eyes); yellowish brown, flaxen, light auburn (hair); blond. Cfr. *dágaw*.

(*pamm*) *ukél*: (breasts) becoming protuberant. This term is applied to the breasts of young women and to the rudimentary breasts of males. *Bukél* means "roundness"; the final *ñg* of the prefix *pañg* is combined with the initial *B* of the stem into *M*; in this term the prefix *pañg* is derived from the prefix *pa*, which means "to cause to happen."

(*bukel*) *bukél*: eyeball; testicle or testis. *Bukél* means "roundness, sphere"; the reduplication indicates resemblance. Cfr. (*okel*) *okél*.

búkot: back.

Búkot ti sáka: back of the foot.

búteg: nasal mucus.

dágaw: yellowish brown, flaxen, light auburn (hair). Cfr. *bugagáw*.

dakúlap: palm (of the hand).

dálem: liver.

dapán: sole (of the foot).

dára: blood.

darañgidonñg: the middle or median part of the nose from the bridge to the tip.

(*dawat*)*dawat*: uvula (of the palate). *Dawat* means "asking"; the reduplication indicates repetition of the action.

(*da*)*dawís(an)*: the depression between the branches of the lower jaw, under the chin. Cfr. *ákat*. *Dawís* means "point"; the suffix is a locative; the reduplication emphasizes the meaning.

(*de*)*denññgeg(án)*: the auditory canal, the eardrum, tympanum or middle ear, and the internal ear or labyrinth. *Denññgeg* means "hearing"; the suffix is a locative; the reduplication emphasizes the meaning.

díkki: tartar (of the teeth).

díla: tongue.

doggónñg: dry nasal mucus.

dóri: spinal column, vertebral column, spine or backbone.

Dóri ti lúlod: tibia or shin bone. Literally: backbone of the calf of the leg.

(*kadka*)*duá*: afterbirth or secundines. *Duá* means "two"; *kaduá* means "companion"; the reduplication indicates resemblance.

dúrek: cerumen or earwax.

dutdút: hair (of the body), fur, wool, coat, feather, plumage, down, pubescence. Cfr. *boók*.

(*ga*)*garaw-át(en)*: the part of the back situated immediately below the shoulder blade. *Gaw-át(en)* means "to reach"; *karáwa* means "groping"; the stem *garaw-át* seems to have to do something with both, especially when one considers the fact that the Iloko generally give as a characteristic quality of this particular part of the body, its being difficult to reach with the hand; besides, the reduplication combined with the suffix means "which has to be or which is generally *"garaw-at"*ed."

gátas: milk.

gayyét: any line or wrinkle that exists naturally without external interference, e. g. in the space back of the knee, in the part of the arm opposite to the elbow, at the wrist (racette or bracelet), on the face, etc. Cfr. *getgét* and *pélad*.

gergér: Cfr. *getgét*.

getgét: any temporary line produced by wrapping, binding, etc. Cfr. *gayyét*.

gisgís: corner of the mouth. *Gisgís* also means: "tearing."

górónñg: shank or shin, the lower part of the leg (between knee and ankle).

gugút: gum (of the teeth).

ima: hand. *Ima* means also: sleeve.

imĩng: beard, mustache, whiskers.

(i)*imút(an)*: the longitudinal groove at the back of the neck. *Imut* means "avariciousness"; the suffix is a locative; the reduplication emphasizes the meaning.

isbú: urine.

(i)*isbu(án)*: meatus urinarius, the external orifice of the urethra. *Isbú* means "urinating"; the suffix is a locative; the reduplication emphasizes the meaning.

*kalabká*b: the adipose tissue that surrounds the viscera.

kallíd: dimple of the cheek. *Kallíd* also means: "cheating, deceiving."

kalúb ti matá: eyelid. Literally: cover of the eye.

kambĩng: fraenum or frenum. *Kambĩng* also means: "bringing together," e. g. sewing together the edges of a rent, etc. Cfr. *barĩnggáwid* and *birĩng*.

(kam)*kaméng*: all organs or members of the body, limbs. *Kaméng* means "limb of a crustacean"; the reduplication indicates resemblance or plurality. The simple form *kámen̄g* (note the change of accent) denotes the genitals.

kanawán: right.

kanigíd: left.

káper: smegma, the sebaceous substance which collects between the glans penis and the foreskin.

karabukób: throat; more especially: gullet, esophagus.

karetkét: the shrivelled or wrinkled part of the scrotum. *Karetkét* also means: "shrivelling."

kátay: saliva or spittle. Cfr. *tuprá*.

katigíd: Cfr. *kanigíd*.

(*kĩbon̄g*)*kĩbon̄g*: the superior part of the buttocks, where they inflect toward the back.

kídáy: eyebrow.

kikít: little finger, auricular finger or ear finger; little toe.

(*kili*)*kilí*: armpit or axilla.

kímat: eyelash. Cfr. *kurimatmát*.

kimmól: coccyx.

kissít: semen.

kokó: nail; claw, hoof.

(*kubāng*)*kúbañg*: buttock.

kúdíl: skin; hide; the skin or membrane situated between the pulp and peel of some fruits, e. g. the lanseh, lansa or lanzon.

kuláput: chorion and amnion (membranes of the fetus); epimysium, perimysium (sheaths of the muscles), aponeurosis and tendon; periosteum; skin of the egg or membrana putaminis; lining of the gizzard; skin or derma of fishes; leaf sheath of the betel palm; the spathaceous bract subtending a cluster of banana flowers; the tissue situated between the pulp and peel of some fruits, e. g. the orange; etc., etc.

kulót: curl, ringlet; curly, crisp, woolly, kinky (hair).

kurimatmát: eyelash. Cfr. *kímat*.

kursiñg: peeling portion of epidermis.

lakkó: the space back of the knee.

Lakkó ti siko: the part of the arm opposite to the elbow. Literally: the *lakkó* of the elbow.

(*lansa*)*lansá*: malleolus. *Lansá* means "(metal) nail"; the reduplication indicates resemblance.

lañgkók: the lower part of the thumb, including the adductor pollicis and the first phalanx.

lañgáy ti díla: mucous membrane of the floor of the mouth. Literally: swimming of the tongue.

lapáyag: ear; pinna, auricle or ear conch.

(*lap*)*lapsí*: hangnail. *Lapsí* means "stripping" (e. g. a twig, of its leaves); the reduplication indicates resemblance. Cfr. (*sa*)*sadút*.

laság: flesh; meat, pulp, etc. (of animals, fruits, etc.).

lasí: dandruff, dander or scurf.

láteg: testicles (scrotum included).

láwas: phalanx or phalange; internode (of bamboo, etc.).

leñgñgés: nape or cervix; poll; the part that connects the haulm or culm with the ear of rice.

liñg-éet: sweat or perspiration.

(*lipay*)*lipay*: kneecap, kneepan, patella or rotula. *Lipay* is the name of the seed of a vine of the genus *Mucuna*; the reduplication indicates resemblance.

(*li*)*lipit*(*én*): the part of the body that corresponds to the armpit, without reference to the hollow. *Lipi* means "pressing, squeezing"; the reduplication combined with the suffix means "which has to be or which is generally (pressed or squeezed)."

(*lo*)*loddók*(*an*): Sternal notch, the depression at the upper part of the breast bone, between the inner ends of the two collar bones.

Loddók means "sound produced by swallowing"; the suffix is a locative; the reduplication emphasizes the meaning.

lokdí: glans penis.

lókoñg: the lower or concave part of the instep; hollow of the hand. Cfr. *rúsok*.

lolon(*án*): the soft part of the head, at the top of the cranium (of little children). *Lolón* means "small bundle"; the suffix is a locative.

(*lo*)*lossok*(*án*): the depression situated above both clavicles, very much apparent in thin persons. *Lossók* means "hole"; the suffix is a locative; the reduplication emphasizes the meaning.

luá: tear or lachryma.

lúlod: calf (of the leg). Cfr. *botóy*.

luppó: thigh.

luy-óng: pubes or pubic region, the lower part of the hypogastric region.

(*ma*)*mañgmáñg*(*an*): corner of the mouth. *Mañgmáñg* is the name of

the sores that appear at that place; the suffix is a locative; the reduplication emphasizes the meaning. Cfr. *gisgís*.

matá: eye; knot (of timber).

merrét: the terminal part of the rectum at the anus.

molódót: hair, down; namely: the hair that grows along the upper edge of the forehead, and that which grows sparsely all over the body of man. Cfr. *dutdút*.

mordónǵ: tip (of a finger, etc.); top (of a tree, etc.); apex (of a leaf, etc.).

moríit: anus; cloaca.

máigínǵ: forehead, front or brow.

múkat: gum (of the eye).

(*mu*)*mukát*(*an*): inner canthus and lachrymal caruncle. *Múkat* means "gum of the eye"; the suffix is a locative; the reduplication emphasizes the meaning.

múkod: heel.

múnǵay: nipple, mamilla or teat; the innermost, edible part of the unopening flower cluster of the banana. Cfr. (*sunay*)*súnay*, under Plants.

mutínǵ: clitoris. Cfr. (*tam*)*tampíra*.

ńǵádas: palate. Cfr. *ńǵanǵáw*.

ńǵanǵá: pit of the stomach. *ńǵanǵá* means "gaping." Cfr. *rúsok*.

ńǵanǵáw: palate. Cfr. *ńǵádas*.

ńǵíwat: mouth.

ńǵíwónǵíw: border of the lip; sometimes: upper lip. Cfr. *bibíg*.

ńǵodó: Cfr. *mordónǵ*; more especially: the part of a bamboo that has been cut off, as distinguished from the stump that remains.

(*ńǵulay*)*ńǵúlay*: wrist or carpus.

(*okel-*)*okél*: testicle or testis. *Okél* means "being born half-way"; the reduplication indicates resemblance. Cfr. (*bukel*)*bukél*.

ókí: pudendum or vulva.

ólo: head.

ormót: pubes, the hair that grows on the pubic region.

(*padínǵ*)*pádínǵ*: hip or haunch; hip bone, haunch bone, huckle bone, innominate bone, iliac bone or ilium.

pálad: line in the palm of the hand, the fingers, the sole of the foot; (transverse) rib of the banana leaf.

páli: pancreas; sweetbread.

palsokít or *p(in)alsokít*: the ordinary form of the chignon at the back of the head, arranged without separation of the tresses. Cfr. *pandinǵgá*.

pandinǵgá: the chignon at the back of the head, formed by rolling up successively both halves of the tresses. Cfr. *palsokít*.

pantók: tip of the nose (when long). Cfr. *tarimáyonǵ*.

(*pa*)*pañǵal*(*án*): the region about the gonion, about the angle of the lower jaw or mandible. *Pañǵál* means "parotitis or mumps"; the suffix is a locative; the reduplication emphasizes the meaning.

(*pa*)*pañyres(án)*: nostril or nasal fossa. *Pañyrés* means "cleaning the nose"; the suffix is a locative; the reduplication emphasizes the meaning.

paraán̄y(an): the part of the upper lip situated immediately under the nose. *Paraán̄gan* also means: "entrance to the house."

paraggág: rib or costa.

(*pam*)*arán̄y*: incisor. *Parán̄y* means "appearing"; the final *N̄G* of the instrumental prefix *pañy* is combined with the initial *P* of the stem into *M. paroñ̄yñ̄gáron̄y*: hair of the nose.

(*paso*)*pasó*: the protuberance at the base of the nape (of fat persons), somewhere at the spinous process of the seventh cervical vertebra; it corresponds to the withers of animals.

patá: marrow or medulla.

pátón̄y: side of the buttock.

pattun̄yág(an): middle finger or long finger.

piñ̄yógól or *p(in)in̄yógól*: chignon.

piñ̄yíl: ankle.

piñ̄ypiñ̄y: cheek.

Piñ̄ypiñ̄y ti óki: labium majus or outer lip of the vulva. Literally: cheek of the vulva.

Piñ̄ypiñ̄y ti úbet: buttock. Literally: cheek of the breech.

(*pi*)*piñ̄yúd(an)*: the region around the ear. *Piñ̄yud* means "cutting off, etc. the ear"; the suffix is a locative; the reduplication emphasizes the meaning.

(*pi*)*pirit(an)*: lobule of the ear, lobe of the ear, ear lobe or earlap. *Pirit* means "taking between the tips of the fingers"; the suffix is a locative; the reduplication emphasizes the meaning. Cfr. (*te*)*tebben̄y(án)*.

piskél: any large muscle of the arm or of the leg.

pispis: temple.

(*poñ̄yog*)*poñ̄yog(án)* or (*poñ̄yog*)*poñ̄yog(án)*: the part of the arm situated immediately above the wrist bone or styloid process of the radius. Cfr. (*ñ̄gúlay*)*ñ̄gúlay*.

pudós: knot or mass of false hair worn in the chignon.

púkal: breast or mamma; udder. Cfr. *sóso*.

pultit: a small portion of stool, generally the first or last to be expelled when moving the bowels.

púnot: Cfr. *pudós*. *Púnot* also means: "causing to be absorbed."

puón: root, base, lower part; unit (for trees, grasses, vines, etc.).

púseg: navel or umbilicus, umbilical cord; eye (of the apple, the squash, etc.).

púso: heart.

pus-ón̄y: hypogastrium, the hypogastric region of the abdomen.

(*pu*)*putól(an)*: the upper part of the bust or thorax, generally uncovered in Iloko women. *Pútol* means "beheading" and "décolleté"; the suffix is a locative; the reduplication emphasizes the meaning.

rámáy: finger, toe.

(*ram*)*ramót*: tendon or sinew of the hand and of the foot. *Ramót* means "root"; the reduplication indicates resemblance.

rúpas: (person) in whose palm one or more transverse lines are continuous, e. g. the line of the head or head line, the line of the heart or heart line. Such persons are supposed to be inclined to use their bolo (or knife) indiscriminately.

(*raway*)*ráway*: the part of the hand situated between the thumb and the index.

ráwis: the part of the hypochondriac and epigastric regions that borders on the eighth, ninth and tenth ribs.

rúpa: face.

Rúpa ti dapán: side of the foot. Literally: face of the sole.

rúsok: epigastrium, the epigastric region of the abdomen; pit of the stomach. Cfr. *nganḡá*.

Rúsok ti dapán: the lower or concave part of the instep. Literally: *rúsok* of the sole.

Rúsok ti úbet: the depression in the side of the buttock. Literally: *rúsok* of the breech.

(*sabót*)*sabót*: brainpan, brain case, brain cap, brain box or cranium. *Sabót* means "coconut shell"; the reduplication indicates resemblance. Cfr. (*banḡa*)*bánḡa*.

sábuṅṅ ti kokó: lunule of the nail. Literally: flower of the nail.

(*sa*)*sadút*: hangnail. *Sadút* means "laziness"; the reduplication emphasizes the meaning. Cfr. (*lap*)*lapsí*.

(*mara*)*sagaysáy*: hair, down; namely: young pubes, the first hair that appears on the pubic region, and the soft, fluffy feathers of young birds. *Sagaysáy* means "comb"; the prefix indicates resemblance. Cfr. *moldót* and *ormót*.

sáka: foot, leg.

(*pan*)*akrúd*: the inguinal region of the abdomen. *Sakrúd* is the name of a net; the final *NG* of the instrumental prefix *paṅḡ* is combined with the initial *S* of the stem into *N*.

(*sal*)*salamági*: tonsil or amygdala (of the pharynx). *Salamági* means "tamarind"; the reduplication indicates resemblance.

sallapíd or *s(in)allapíd*: queue, braid or plait; braided or plaited (hair).

sánḡi: molar or molar tooth; the pinna at the base of the blade of some palm leaves, e. g. the leaf of the buri palm (*Corypha elata*).

saónḡ: canine or canine tooth; tusk.

(*sa*)*sará(an)*: the region of the parietal bone situated somewhere at the center of its posterior part. *Sára* means "horn"; the suffix is a locative; the reduplication emphasizes the meaning.

(*pa*)*sariw-át*: annulary or ring finger. *Sariw-át* means "going beyond"; the prefix means: causing to; etymologically this should be the name of the middle finger.

sellánḡ: groin or inguen.

sep-ánḡ: twister, the upper part of the thigh at the inside.

sibet: Cfr. *siket*.

siket: waist.

sikig(án): side (from shoulder to foot).

siko: elbow.

silét: small intestine (duodenum, jejunum and ileum).

(*si*)*siñgíl(an)*: the part of the body situated between the humerus and the shoulder blade.

són̄go: jaws and nose, the lower part of the face; muzzle, snout.

sóso: breast or mamma (rudimentary in the male); udder. Cfr. *púkal*.

súpot: scrotum. *Súpot* also means "pouch."

suprĩñ̄g: a whirl in the hair near the front. *Suprĩñ̄g* also means "with hair on end, disobedient."

suúp or (*pag*)*suup(án)*: articulation, joint or juncture.

tabá: fat or adipose tissue.

tagpáw: the region situated between the waist and the most protuberant part of the upper umbilical and lumbar regions; the superior part of the buttocks, where they inflect toward the back. Cfr. (*kibon̄g*)*kibon̄g*.

takéd: the part of the skin that covers the base of the nail immediately. *Takéd* also means "strength."

takki: stool, feces, faeces, excrement, ordure; dung.

(*ta*)*takki(án)*: anus; cloaca. *Takki* means "feces"; the suffix is a locative; the reduplication emphasizes the meaning.

takkiág: arm.

talipugón̄g: the part of the hair of women that bulges out above the forehead; crest or tuft of feathers.

(*taman*)*táman*: nymphae, labia minora or inner lips of the vulva (orifice of the vagina included). *Táman* means "(beams, etc.) resting on their narrower side" (the common way of placing floor joists, etc.); the reduplication indicates resemblance or repetition.

tammudó: forefinger, index or index finger.

(*tam*)*tampíra*: clitoris. Cfr. *mutĩñ̄g*.

tan̄yán: thumb or pollex; great toe or hallux.

(*tao*)*táo*: pupil or apple of the eye. *Táo* means "man"; the reduplication indicates resemblance.

(*tapak*)*tápak*: occiput. *Tápak* means "outrigger of a canoe" (now obsolete); the reduplication indicates resemblance.

tarimáyon̄g: tip of the nose (when not long). Cfr. *pantók*.

(*te*)*tebbēñ̄g(án)*: lobule of the ear, lobe of the ear. *Tebbēñ̄g* means "hole in the ear lobe"; the suffix is a locative; the reduplication emphasizes the meaning. Cfr. (*pi*)*pírít(an)*.

teltél: the upper part (covered with hair) of the nape from theinion down.

teñ̄ñ̄géd: neck.

tián: abdomen or belly.

tímid: chin.

toktók: crown of the head.

tubbóg ti sóso: milk. Literally: juice of the breast.

(*tubon̄g*)*túbon̄g*: base of the aorta, base of the pulmonary artery. *Túbōn̄g* means "section of bamboo" (one or more internodes); the reduplication indicates resemblance.

tulán̄g: bone; cartilage or gristle; skeleton; baleen or whalebone.

(*tu*)*túlen̄g*: the groove at the back of the ear, where the pinna is inserted. *Túlen̄g* means "deafness"; the reduplication emphasizes the meaning.

túmen̄g: knee.

tuprá: saliva, spittle, spit or sputum. Cfr. *kátay*.

turkák: phlegm, spittle, spit or sputum.

úbet: buttocks, breech or posteriors, rump.

(*upa*)*úpa*: down, namely: the hair that grows along the upper edge of the forehead of women in childbed. *Upa* means either "hen" or "renting"; the reduplication indicates resemblance.

urát: vein or vena; artery; nerve; sinew or tendon; fiber or fibre; nerve or vein (of a leaf, etc.); nervil or nerville.

útek: brain, cerebrum and cerebellum or little brain.

II. ANIMALS.

alúd: embryo fetus or foetus.

ampáw: empty (shell, nut, etc.).

ánut: meat full of sinews.

(*nag*)*arimon̄gmón̄g*(*an*): the particles of fat distributed in the adipose tissue situated under the skin of the abdomen of swine. *Arimon̄gmón̄g* means "gathering"; the combination *nag...an* is also a locative.

ásan̄g: gill or branchia.

baláy: shell, carapace (of a turtle, a crab, etc.). *Baláy* also means "house."

(*bal*)*balúlān̄g*: Cfr. (*suka*)*suká*. *Balúlān̄g* is the name of a kind of basket; the reduplication indicates resemblance.

bánor: strip of dried meat. *Bánor* is also the name of a kind of elongated cowpea.

batikulén̄g: gizzard or gigerium.

bódo: hair (of caterpillars, etc.); bristle (of plants).

bon̄gkaló: hooks or hook bones.

búgi: roe; spawn; coral. The eggs or ovaries of fishes, crustaceans, etc.

burábur: sting or spine, the caudal spine of the sting ray. Trees are said to die when pricked with it.

(*bu*)*bussog*(*á*): the part of the flank of a quadruped that bulges out when the animal is satiated. *Bussóg* means "satiety"; the suffix is a locative; the reduplication emphasizes the meaning. Cfr. *kulay-ón̄g*.

(*dagum*)*dágum*: sting (of bees, wasps, etc.). *Dágum* means "needle"; the reduplication indicates resemblance.

gámat: arm (of cuttlefishes, etc.); tendril. Cfr. *kamén̄g*.

gíta: venom.

ibbāṅ: with chicken. This is said of eggs in the last stages of incubation. Cfr. (*nanṅ*)*luāṅ*.

ipit: chela, the claw or pincerlike organ (pincers) terminating certain limbs of some crustaceans.

ipus: tail.

itlóg: egg.

(i)*tlog(án)*: uterus (of birds). *Itlóg* means "egg"; the suffix is a locative; the reduplication emphasizes the meaning.

kalanniúg: glair, albumen or white (of the egg). Probably derived from *núg*, coconut.

kaméṅ: limb (of crustaceans), e. g.: mouth parts (mandibles, maxillae and maxillipeds), pincers, walking legs, swimming legs, eye stalks, antennae, etc.; tendril. Cfr. *gámat*.

k(in)arakár(an): crop, craw or ingluvies. *Karákar* means "intending, anticipating"; the combination . *in* . . . *an* is the past form of the suffix *an* of transitive verbs; the suffix is generally a locative at the same time.

karaykáy: rasorial foot; gallatorial foot. *Karaykáy* also means "scratching."

kawwét: spur or cockspur.

kellá: slime, the mucuslike secretion of the skin of eels, etc.

(*pa*)*kikít*: dewclaw; fetlock. *Kikít* means "little finger"; the prefix is an instrumental.

kiwkiw: caudal fin or tail.

(*kon*)*koníkon*: small intestine (of chickens). The corresponding part in men and animals in general is called *silét*. *Koníkon* means "wringing"; the reduplication represents the progressive form.

konsisinsál: the areolar or reticular tissue situated under the skin of swine, sheep, etc.

kúkod: shank; shin; cannon.

kulay-óṅṅ: the depression in the flank of a quadruped. Cfr. (*bu*)-*bussog(án)*.

kútit: buttocks; rump.

(*lá*)*laem*: viscera or entrails. *Laém* means "inside"; the reduplication indicates plurality.

lálát: hide; kip or kipskin; leather.

(*lambí*)*lambí*: dewlap; wattle. *Lambí* is the name, now obsolete, of a kind of jar; the reduplication indicates resemblance.

(*la*)*naná(an)*: uropygial gland, coccygeal gland or oil gland. *Lána* means "coconut oil"; the suffix is a locative; the reduplication emphasizes the meaning.

lápi: thigh; ham; round of beef; shoulder.

kapsút: lining of the gizzard. *Lapsút* also means "slipping." Cfr. *kuláput*, under Men.

lawí: the showy feathers in the tail of a cock, sickles, etc.

(*li*)*lidíṅ(an)*: the hole bored in the nasal septum. *Lidíṅ* means

ring (of a cow, etc.); the suffix is a locative; the reduplication emphasizes the meaning.

logít: dung or excrement (of birds).

(*nañy*)*luáñy*: addle; incubated or brooded. This is said of incubated eggs in which no young yet appears. Cfr. *ibbúñy*. *Luáñy* means vacuousness; the prefix is the past form of the transitive prefix *mañy*.

ludlúd: lip (of fishes); cambium.

ñgárab: the lateral fins of the ray, extending from the tail to the head on both sides. *Ñgárab* also means "brim."

ñgoronñgór(an): throat (of the hog). *Ñgoronñgor* means "cutting the throat"; the suffix is a locative.

(*kama*)*oná*: fore leg, forefoot. *Oná* means "preceding." The prefixes *ka* and *ma* are used to form substantives and adjectives respectively.

paddák: sole (of the foot of swine, etc.).

pái: the skin on both sides of the tail of the ray.

(*pá*)*pait*: the thick juice obtained from the bowels of ruminants.

(*pá*)*pait*: the thick juice obtained from the bowels of ruminants. *Pait* means "bitterness"; the reduplication represents the progressive form.

(*pa*)*pakko(án)*: neck (of the cow, etc.). *Páko* means "yoke"; the suffix is a locative; the reduplication emphasizes the meaning.

(*pa*)*pañgál(an)*: hock. *Pañgal* means "step" (rest for the foot in ascending or descending); the suffix is a locative; the reduplication emphasizes the meaning.

pátaw: cuttle bone.

páwak: dorsal fin.

páwis: pinion, the distal part of a bird's wing; knee (of quadrupeds).

páyák: wing.

pennét: elastic tissue (of quadrupeds).

pespés: half-digested food of ruminants found in their stomach.

pígar: fin; mane. Cfr. *kiwkiw* and *páwak*.

p(in)íkon: Cfr. (*kon*)*koníkon*. *Píkon* means "bending"; the infix is the past form of the transitive suffix *en* and is used to form past participles.

pulá: the soft, yellow or red (when cooked), central part of a crab.

p(in)uskól: the upper part of the rumen or paunch, next following the esophagus. *Puskól* means "thickness"; the infix *in* is the past form of the transitive suffix *en* and is used to form past participles.

(*pañgpuy*)*puyot(án)*: the lower part of the windpipe or trachea of animals. *Puyót* means "blowing"; the reduplication represents the progressive form; the combination *pañy* . . . *an* is a locative.

(*rak*)*rakípa*: rumen or paunch.

rónngo: mouth parts, antennae and eye stalks of shrimps and lobsters. Cfr. *kaméñy*.

(*sab*)*sabunñánay*: the numerous, more or less soft, riblike parts of a crab, situated on both sides of the body and folded under the shell. Cfr. *sabunñánay*, under Plants; the reduplication indicates resemblance.

sañgá: tine or point (brow antler, bay-antler or bez-antler, royal antler, sur-royal or crown antler); branch, ramification, offshoot, lateral shoot.

sára: horn; antler (beam and tines).

sawák: crooked, deformed or distorted (horn of a water buffalo or carabao).

(*pa*)*sgar(én)*: the feathers that stand on end very easily, e. g. those situated at the back of the head of a cock, the hackle. *Seggár* means "standing on end"; the combination *pa . . . en* means "to cause to."

s(in)igpít: the part of the brisket between the fore legs. *Sigpít* means "squeezing"; the infix is the past form of the transitive suffix *en* and is used to form past participles.

sít: fishbone; spine; prickly; thorn.

sikil: Cfr. *siñgíl*.

siksik: scale.

siñgíl: barbel.

sippít: beak, bill or nib.

sobbók: Cfr. *subsub*.

soklád: flat (horn of a cow).

súbil: snout, the long projecting nose of swine.

subsub: snout, the projecting jaws and nose of swine.

(*suka*)*suká*: the adipose tissue situated at and near the rumen of cows and carabaos. *Suká* means "vinegar"; the reduplication indicates resemblance. Cfr. (*bal*)*balúlanṅ*.

(*ta*)*taldénṅ(án)*: hole in the ear. *Taldénṅ* means "piercing"; the suffix is a locative; the reduplication emphasizes the meaning.

tapinṅár: comb (of a fowl).

(*to*)*tób-ók(an)*: nasal septum. *Tób-ók* means "piercing (the nasal septum)"; the suffix is a locative; the reduplication emphasizes the meaning.

tókoṅṅ: tailless (fowl).

tudó: branchless antler. *Tudó* also means "pointing."

(*tu*)*tugaw(án)*: ischial callosity. *Tugaw* means "sitting"; the suffix is a locative; the reduplication emphasizes the meaning.

(*kama*)*údi*: hind leg, hind foot. *Údi* means "rear"; the prefixes *ka* and *ma* are used to form substantives and adjectives, respectively.

ukis: shell (of the egg); bark, rind, husk, peel, hull, skin, shell, paring, seed vessel, pericarp, envelope, covering, cover, integument, tegument, tegmen, testa, coat, membrane, epidermis, etc.

III. PLANTS.

alas-ás: fallen dry leaves, dry leaves that have fallen from trees, etc.; more especially: dry leaves detached from the stalks of the sugar cane. *Alas-ás* also means "tearing off."

alugañṅi(án): straw (of rice), namely: the part that has been cut off at the time of the harvest, about five inches long; this term does not include the ear, even though it be devoid of grain.

(*ag*) *alunét*: young (betel nut, just formed, not yet ripe). *Ag* is the common prefix of intransitive verbs.

alupási: dry sheath of the banana leaf. Cfr. *ubbák*.

ambulíg (an): cob or corncob.

amurát: fibers (of the camote or sweet potato, either of its root or of its vine); hence: the fibrous, central part of some varieties of sweet potatoes; also: a variety of sweet potato full of fibers.

amurít: the part of the root of a sweet potato next to the vine; when planting sweet potatoes, the Iloko cut off a small part of the root (the *amurít*) to which a part of the vine remains attached, and stick it in the ground.

apis: the tawny, netlike appendages situated at the base of the leaf of the coco palm.

arotáng: straw (of rice), namely: the part that has been cut off at the time of the harvest; this term includes whatever is left of a bundle of rice after pounding. Cfr. *alugañgñán*.

as-ás: dry leaves (of sugar cane, Indian corn, etc.). *As-ás* also means "pounding thoroughly, pounding a second time."

bagás: kernel; more especially: rice (when pounded or unhusked); also: tuber, rootstock or rhizome, (tuberous) root, bulb, corm.

balaniúg: leaf of the coco palm.

ballagúbag: alburnum, sapwood or splintwood. Cfr. *búgas*.

ballát: the inner part of the wood of the bamboo, the rattan, etc., namely: that part which is cut off when the stems are thinned for binding purposes.

(*mara*) *banbán*: young pod (of the cowpea). *Banbán* means "strip of bamboo"; the prefix indicates resemblance. Cfr. (*mara*) *dágum*.

(*agin*) *bará*: ripening, red (jambool or Java plum). When completely ripe, it is black. *Bará* means "lung"; *ag* is the common prefix of intransitive verbs; the prefix *in* adds nothing to the meaning.

barakbák: withered leaf.

barakúbak: Cfr. *barakbák*.

(*bar*) *barániw*: (edible) young branches (of cucurbitaceous vines). *Barániw* means "lemon grass"; the reduplication indicates resemblance. Cfr. *rañgáw*.

baték: (white) spot (on tobacco leaves). *Baték* also means bead.

bayyatáng: the fruit of the *labtáng*-vine (*Anamirta cocculus*). It is used to poison fishes.

bekkág: cotton boll, the fruit of the cotton plant before it bursts open. *Bekág* also means "emitting."

belláng: wood of the palma brava.

bílid: wing (of fruits, etc.).

(*botto*) *bottó* or (*botto*) *botto(án)*: the pistillate flower cluster of the breadfruit. *Bottó* means "pivot"; also "position of the child ready to be born." *Bottoán* should mean literally "full of pivots" or "with a large pivot"; hence "callosity." The reduplications indicate resemblance.

búgas: the central part of the trunk of a tree or shrub or of one of its branches; hence: heartwood or duramen and pith or medulla. Cfr. *ballagúbag*.

bukél: seed stone (of a drupaceous fruit). *Bukél* also means "roundness, sphere."

bulandáy: the fruit of the buri palm (*Corypha elata*).

búlig: bunch or cluster (of bananas), the whole fruit cluster. Cfr. *sápad*.

bulóny: leaf.

búnel: the bulbous base of the stalk of the banana.

bunót: coir, the outer husk of the coconut.

bún̄ga: fruit (berry, capsule, drupe, etaerio, follicle, glans, legume or pod, loment, nut, pepo, pome, schizocarp, silicle, silique, sorosis, strobile, syconium or syconus, etc.).

(*bun̄ga*)*bún̄ga*: the fruit of the uvi (or *úbi*) yam. *Bún̄ga* means "fruit"; the reduplication emphasizes the meaning.

bún̄gag: embryo or germ (of seeds).

bún̄gíl: very hard betel nut, very hard nut of the fish-tail palm.

burarúwit: long branch (of bamboo), pendulous top (of bamboo).

búsel: flower bud (of pistillate flowers, either hermaphrodite or monoclinous, or not). Cfr. *keppét*.

butáyon̄g: spathe (of the coco palm, the betel palm, etc.).

(*mará*)*búteg*: young fruit (just formed, not yet ripe); more especially: young betel nut. *Búteg* means "nasal mucus"; the prefix indicates resemblance.

dádag: ripening (beans, peas, etc.). This term is applied to pods or legumes that have become yellowish and more or less dry. Cfr. *daran̄gí-dán̄gan*.

(*mará*)*dágum*: young pod (of the cowpea). This term is applied to the pod, while the petals of the corolla still adhere to it. *Dágum* means "needle"; the prefix indicates resemblance. Cfr. (*mará*)*banbán*.

dalapdáp: creeping shoot, runner.

daran̄gídán̄g(an): ripening fruit. When it has changed color and is nearly ripe. Cfr. (*apag*)*ludiág*.

dáwa: ear or spike.

digó: milk or juice (of the coconut). *Digó* also means "broth."

gánot: the white skin or membrane that surrounds the edible yellow pulp of the jack. *Gánot* also means "pulling out (herbs)."

garámi: straw or stalk (of grain).

garasigás(an): ripening betel nut. When it is very near changing color.

gettá: the milk contained in the coconut meat and obtained by pressing the latter.

gunnót: fiber or fibre (of *abaká* or Manila hemp, *piña* or pineapple, etc.); the fibre attached to the stone of the mango.

íbo: awn, beard.

íit: the central rib of the leaflets of the coco palm, the buri palm, etc.

irík: the grains or kernels of rice, when separated from the stalk.

ittá: an unhusked kernel of rice mixed with husked or cooked rice.

kalaṅgákaṅg: the tamarind, when overripe and nearly dry, the skin sticking to the seed.

kalawtkaw: (edible) young branches (of the cowpea).

kamtrínṅ: the juice of the unripe mango. *Kamtrínṅ* is also the name of a tree, *Semecarpus cuneiformis*, which causes a very irritating rash.

kamotit: the last *sápad* of the banana fruit cluster. Cfr. *sápad*.

karamukóm: the guava, when very hard, just before ripening.

kariskís: dry bark.

karissábunṅ: young guava, mango, etc., when just formed, the petals of the corolla sometimes still sticking to it. Probably a derivative of *sábunṅ*, "flower."

(*ka*)*karúy(en)*: very soft coconut meat, when it is still pulpy. *Kárúy* means "scraping out soft coconut meat"; the reduplication combined with the suffix; "which has to be or is generally (scraped out, etc.)." Cfr. (*lu*)*lukót(en)* and *taramosián*.

káwad: tobacco leaves, harvested second in order and next following the *palaspás*; their tips generally rest on the ground. *Káwad* also means "groping," etc. Cfr. *palaspás* and *puṅṅánay*.

káwaw: empty or almost empty coconut, containing very little or no milk and scattered patches of meat or none.

káyo: tree; wood, timber, lumber; stem, trunk, stalk, stock, stipe.

keppét: flower bud (of staminate flowers). *Keppét* also means "closing" (of the eyes, a wound, etc.). Cfr. *búsel*.

kópag: copra, namely: coconut meat after the milk or *gettá* has been expressed and before the oil or *lána* is extracted by boiling.

kullapit: young fruit (just formed, not yet ripe); more especially: young pod of the *Pithecolobium dulce*.

ládek: coconut meat from which the oil has been extracted.

lána: coconut oil, coconut butter.

lános: sterile plant (e. g.: Indian corn that bears only staminate flowers, coco palms, etc.).

lantónṅg: young shoot (of the camote or sweet potato).

lapá: spadix (of the betel palm). Cfr. *sar-áy*.

lilíg: pulpy carpel of the orange.

littokó: the fruit of the rattan (*Calamus* sp.).

lónṅog: hollow of a tree.

lubbuág: first vegetation, first plants that appear at the beginning of the rainy season; more especially: tall stalks of sugar cane found scattered among the others in a field of sugar cane.

(*apag*)*ludiág*: ripening fruit. When it begins to change color. The prefix means "scarcely, just beginning to." Cfr. *daraṅgidánṅan*.

lugaṅgi(án): Cfr. *alugaṅgián*.

(*lu*)*lukót(en)*: soft coconut meat, when it has become consistent, the intermediate stage between *kakarúyen* and *taramosián*. *Lúkot* means "roll-

ing up"; the reduplication combined with the suffix; "which has to be or which is generally (rolled up)." Cfr. (*ka*)*karáy(en)* and *taramosián*.

lúpis: pericarp (of the cotton boll).

marsabá: ripe tamarind.

mímis: young shoot (of the cogon).

mónit: the dirt that falls out of cotton, when the latter is taken out of the boll and cleaned by shaking and unravelling.

músot: small and seedless jambol or Java plum.

múta: stamen; anther.

múyod: top (of the ear of rice). Rarely said of the top of trees.

ngorét: the base of the stalk of sugar cane, where the internodes are short and the adventitious roots grow.

oñgkáy: stem (of a leaf, a flower, an inflorescence, a fruit); rachis; peduncle, pedicel; petiole, petiolule.

oró: the fruit of a vitaceous plant, the *Tetrastigma harmandii*.

ósanñ: bagasse (of sugar cane).

(*palad*)*pálad*: the three black veins of a coconut shell. *Pálad* means "line in the palm of the hand"; the reduplication indicates resemblance.

palakpák: (cut-off) leaf. This term is applied to palm leaves, and sometimes to any other large leaves, as those of the banana, the sugar cane, etc., provided they be separated from the stem.

palaspás: tobacco leaves, harvested first in order and next preceding the *káwad*. Cfr. *káwad* and *punñánay*.

palátanñ: rachis (of pinnately compound palm leaves); stem or petiole (of palmate palm leaves); midrib (of banana leaves, etc.).

palat-áññ(an): leaf (of palms, bananas, etc.).

palonñápinñ: small tobacco leaves, generally found at the axils. Not to be confounded with *parunápin* (called *palugápig* in the Northern towns): a kind of very hard timber.

palugápig: Cfr. *palonñápinñ*. It is a synonym of *parunápin*.

palusápis: involucre (of cotton).

páor: dry coconut (completely ripe).

pápenñ: young coconut.

pára: the sprouting embryo of the coconut, before the cotyledon appears. *Pára* also means "bubbling (water)."

paraññípanñ: olive, namely: the fruit of the olive tree.

(*parog*)*párog*: Cfr. (*sugud*)*súgud*.

(*pas*)*pasáy(an)*: the top of young shoots. *Pasáyan* is the name of a kind of shrimp; the reduplication indicates resemblance.

pegpég: rice kernels beaten to pieces.

(*mara*)*pegpég*: small fruit (just formed; e. g.: guavas, Java plums, etc.; not: bananas, etc.); small kernel (of rice, Indian corn, etc.). Cfr. *pegpég*; the prefix indicates resemblance.

piet: the fibre of the *palátanñ* of palm leaves; more especially: the fibre of the petiole or stem of the leaves of the buri palm.

pigkét: the glutinous substance exuded by several trees, e. g.: acacias, orange trees, etc.; gum. Cfr. *tútót*.

poñpóny: stump or stub (of bamboos), namely: the part of a bamboo which remains in the earth after the stem has been broken off by the wind, etc., and which is usually larger than when the stem has been cut off. Cfr. *ñgodó*, under Men, *pútek* and *puñgdól*.

puñánay: first stalk of the sugar cane; tobacco leaves, harvested third in order and next following the *káwad*: they form the largest part of the crop and are called by that name because they are the first to be put on the market, the two others being practically valueless. *Puñánay* also means "beginning."

puñgdól: stump or stub (of trees). Cfr. *poñpóny* and *pútek*.

puriket: the oil of the peel or rind of the orange and of the bark of its tree. *Puriket* is also the name of the plant called "beggar-ticks."

(*pu*)*puros(án)*: the part of the plant (bark, skin, etc.) that is torn off together with the fruit, when the latter is plucked. *Puros* means "plucking (fruits)"; the suffix is a locative; the reduplication emphasizes the meaning.

pútek: stump or stub (of bamboos), namely: the part of a bamboo remaining in the earth after the stem is cut off. Cfr. *poñpóny*.

raáy: bunch or cluster (of fruits, e. g.: grapes, lanzones, *bulandáy*, etc.).

rabóny: young (edible) shoot of bamboo, up to about twenty inches.

ragádi: the hooks on the petioles of rattan leaves; the prickles on the stems or petioles of buri-palm leaves. *Ragádi* also means "saw."

ramót: root (all except tuberous roots); radicle, radicle, rhizoid, rootlet. Cfr. *bagás*.

rañgáw: (edible) young branches (of cucurbitaceous vines). Cfr. (*bar*) *baránw*.

rápany: the branches of the rootstock or rhizome of the ginger.

(*agpa*)*rgáay*: to be on the point of earing; sometimes: to shed pollen (which is probably the original meaning). Applied to rice. *Reggáay* means "falling off"; the compound prefix "to cause to."

regnás: kernels, spikelets and ears of rice detached from one or more bundles.

ripiny: double (fruit), e. g.: two bananas in one skin.

rúsiny: seedling, hypocotyl.

rútony: protuberance (on some fruits, e. g.: that of the *Momordica charantia*).

sabót: coconut shell.

sábuñy: flower; perianth, corolla, petals.

sabuñánay: the unopened flower cluster of the banana; the unopening part of the flower cluster of the banana.

sagibo: aftergrowth (of rice).

sagibsið: shoot (of the sugar cane, the taro, the banana, etc.). Cfr. *subbuál*, *sarinñit*, *taróbony* and *túbo*.

salápi: young ear of Indian corn (not yet ripe).

salapsáp(en): to pick or to pluck (bulky fruits, e. g.: ears of corn, jacks, etc.; not: jambools, guavas, etc.). *En* is the common suffix of transitive verbs.

(*pa*) *sallábay*: the two upper leaves of topped tobacco plants. *Sallábay* means "carrying something or somebody hanging around one's neck from behind"; the prefix means "to have oneself (carried, etc.)."

salóg: cutting or slip (of sugar cane), the upper part of a stalk of sugar cane used for propagation. Cfr. *sebbák*.

s(in)áma: small jack; young branches (of vines). *Sáma* means "fault, error"; the infix forms past participles.

saníp: bunch or cluster (of palm flowers, e. g.: of the betel palm, the coco palm, etc.).

santák: layer, runner.

sanǵét: the central part (top and base cut off) of the unopened spathe of the betel palm. It is chiefly used as a receptacle for bunches of cotton ready for spinning.

sápad: bunch or cluster (of bananas), the bananas (generally from ten to twenty) that are subtended by a single spathaceous bract. Cfr. *búlig*.

sápal: fork (of a tree, etc.).

saramosi(án): Cfr. *taramosián*.

sar-áy: spadix (of the coco palm). Cfr. *lapá*.

sarínǵit: shoot, namely: when a dead branch, some part that has been cut off, etc., reshoots. Cfr. *taróboǵ*, *túbo*, *sagibsiǵ* and *subbuál*.

sebbák: stock (of the sugar cane), the original cutting that has produced new shoots and is then cut out. Cfr. *salóg*.

solbóg: the shooting core of the stalk of the sugar cane, the banana, etc., after the latter has been cut off. *Solbóg* also means "tempting."

subbuál: shoot (of the banana, the sugar cane, etc.). Cfr. *sagibsiǵ*, *sarínǵit*, *taróboǵ* and *túbo*.

(*sugud*) *súgud*: the fruit of a cucurbitaceous plant, the *Momordica ovata*. *Súgud* means "comb, reed of a loom"; the reduplication indicates resemblance. Cfr. (*parog*) *párog*.

(*sunay*) *súnay*: the innermost edible part of the unopening flower cluster of the banana. *Súnay* means "top" (a child's toy); the reduplication indicates resemblance. Cfr. *múnǵay*, under *Men*.

sunǵét: the small parts of the husk or hull of rice (generally the part of the husk next to the pedicel) that remain attached to the kernel, especially when the latter has been beaten to pieces.

tában: select, choice, exquisite, superior, of the best quality. Applied to coconuts, betel nuts, fruits of the red pepper or chili, etc.

taép: chaff; glume, husk or hull (of grains).

tagiǵtǵiǵ: young bamboo (*Schizostachyum mucronatum* or *bólo*) about an inch in diameter.

táko: section of a dry bottle gourd; it is used as a hat, a dish, etc. *Táko* also means "drawing (water)."

talopák: sheath of the banana leaf, when separated from the stem. Cfr. *ubbák*.

tanábug: young twig, young branch; stem of a young tree or shrub.

tános: main branch (of a tree).

taramosi(án): hard coconut meat. Cfr. *(ka)karúy(en)* and *(lu)lukót(en)*.

taróboñg: sprout or shoot (from a root or tuber). Cfr. *túbo*, *sarínġit*, *sagibstb* and *subduál*.

(nan)ba(án): the bulbous lower part of the banana stem. *Tebbá* means "cutting down bananas"; the combination *pañg . . . an* (past form: *nañg . . . an*) indicates the place where something is done; the final *ñg* of the prefix is combined with the initial *T* of the stem into *N*.

tubá: juice of the buri palm, coco palm, nipa palm and bamboo. Also: the drink made from it.

tubbóg: juice, sap, gum, resin.

túbo: sprout or shoot (from a seed). Cfr. *taróboñg*, *sarínġit*, *sagibstb* and *subduál*.

tútót: resin, oil. It is obtained from pine trees, physic nuts, etc. Cfr. *pigkét*.

túyo: bran. *Túyo* is as dust compared to *taép*.

ubbák: sheath of the banana leaf. Cfr. *talopák*.

úbug: unspread leaf (of the coco palm, the betel palm, etc.).

uggót: young leaf (of the banana, the cowpea, etc., etc.), whether unspread or not.

(nañg-)us(án): skinned section of the stalk of the sugar cane. *Us* means "chewing sugar cane"; the combination *pañg . . . an* (past form: *nañg . . . an*) indicates the place where something is done.

wakwák: lateral appendages of the stem, e. g.: leaves, leaf sheaths, etc. (of sugar cane, bananas, etc.); not: the leaves at the top.

THE OATH IN COURT PROCEDURE IN EARLY BABYLONIA AND THE OLD TESTAMENT

IRA M. PRICE
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

A COMMON everyday custom among Oriental peoples, especially Semites, is to emphasize anything they may say, even trivialities, with an oath of one kind or another. This habit or custom came down from a far-off antiquity, whose origin is still beyond our ken. And the acts or words, classed as oaths, cover a considerable range of meaning. They have been widely and comprehensively discussed for long years. The magnitude of the theme requires that we limit its treatment to specific lines. This we wish to do by confining our attention to the character and significance of the oath as used in court procedure in Babylonia and the Old Testament.

One of the essentials in the discussion is to determine as far as possible the fundamental meanings of the words used for oath, and the usage of these words in the periods under survey. This requires an examination of the Sumerian, Babylonian, and Hebrew terms employed. Briefly the Sumerian and Babylonian words are these:

1. *Nam-erím* = *mamîtu* (Br. 2178), "oath," "ban," "curse," used especially in incantations, with an appeal to some god or king or witness. It was also used as an oath where no appeal was made either to god or man, where the actor merely took his oath. A third use is that found in the execution of treaties between peoples and nations, as E-an-na-tum, king of Lagash, with the city of Umma (ca. 2900 B. C.). The oath was taken and confirmed in the camp of Ningirsu, son of En-lil; the person or god by whom the oath is taken will slay the violator of that oath.

The Semitic origin of this common word for oath is probably a root *yama*, 'oath,' 'ban,' or 'curse,' or Arabic *wama'a*, "to make a sign with the hand" (Mercer, *Oath*, p. 26). Among the Arabs the only really binding and sacred oath is the *yamîn*, 'faithful,' akin to *mamîtu*.

There is also a goddess *Mamîtu*, consort of Nergal, the god of devastation, pestilence (cf. *AJSL.*, April, 1910, pp. 170-171), who has been personified (Langdon, *Sumerian and Babylonian Psalms*, p. xix).

If *Mamîtu*, the goddess of devastation, pestilence, and death, was the same word as that used for oath, it is transparently clear why that oath would kindle the thought of fear, dread, and even terror on the part of those who invoked her.

2. *Nam-erîm-kud-da* = *mamîtu tamû* (Br. 2182), "to speak or take an oath"; *nam-erîm-ag-a* = the same meaning (Br. 2184); *tamû* = *pad-da* (Br. 9422), "name," "call on," in an oath formula. *Tamû* is often used with *mamîtu* in oath-taking, indicating that the act carried with it more than the mere swearing; in fact, a serious result under proper circumstances.

3. *Zi* = *nîš* (Br. 2325), "lifting up." It was used in the lifting up of the hand in an oath both in Babylonia and the Old Testament (cf. Gen. 14. 22; Deut. 32. 4); there are scores of illustrations. The term *zi* in Sumerian, however, means in one case, *nasâhu* (Br. 2323), "to root out, extirpate"; in another, *tebû* (Br. 2325), "to approach violently, to be furious (with evil intent)," both emphasizing the thought of penalty, punishment, ban, curse. In some cases *nîš* alone means "oath," its full import to be weighed by the context.

These three words are the chief terms employed in early Babylonia for oath as such, each carrying a signification of its own as determined by the context.

On the basis of these derivations and of the usages in vogue we discover that the oath was closely related to the covenant, the vow, the ordeal, and the curse. Indeed, *mamîtu* was a conditional curse, wherein the oath-taker invoked upon himself the punishment of the gods if he failed to keep his promise. In other words, there seems to have been primitively a religious basis for the serious oath, in which the swearer wished for himself condign punishment for a possible breach of contract. Driver goes so far (*Deut.*, p. 95) as to say that taking the oath was "a confession of faith." So impressive was the oath required of contestants at a trial that we find in Gudea (Cyl. A 8, 6) that the hall of judgment was called, "that terrible place."

The oaths which we are discussing are of two kinds, the affirmative and the pledged-promise. The affirmative deals with assertions that the word spoken is the truth, that the act done is right, calling upon god as witness without invoking any punishment or

curse if it should prove to be a lie. This was the chief kind of oath taken in business transactions where both parties to the deal and witnesses were on hand, and sometimes even when no witnesses are named. If, however, such an affirmative oath were violated the case would most likely find its way into court where resort would be taken, before the end of the matter, to the pledged-promise. In this pledged-promise, the most solemn of all oaths, the parties in the case were sworn by the priests of the temple, in the temple, before an emblem or shrine, at the gate of the temple, or at the designated court tribunal. They took the oath in the name of one or more gods, the ruling king, and a city; either by all of these combined or singly, except that of a city.

In the years prior to, and during most of, the long 43 years reign of Hammurabi, the priests were masters of court procedure, and seem to have held it in or about the temple of the patron deity of the city. They were also the judges and rendered the decisions. Before the close of Hammurabi's sway, however, civil officers are found to be in charge of the secular functions of the court, with priests in full attendance as administerers of the oath, and as executors, in the main, of the sentences pronounced.

The organization of court procedure in early Babylonia has been eruditely discussed by Edouard Cuq, the noted French legalist (*RA.*, VII, pp. 65-101), so that we need only to note where the oath was used and what it achieved in the advancement of justice.

We are handicapped at the very start of our study by the evident abbreviations of the reports of the court proceedings, probably required by the limitations of the size of tablets used by the recorders. When the scribe, i. e. the priest, for they were usually the recorders, gives the gist of the proceedings of the entire trial of that day, he leaves out all the details familiar to the readers of his times, the detailed charges and counter-charges of the accuser and accused, respectively, the testimony of witnesses, the arguments of the plaintiff and the rebuttals of the defence, and the reasons given by the judge or judges for rendering the decision for or against the plaintiff. He sometimes mentions the oath administered to the parties in the trial, and usually the names of the witnesses, if he gives them at all, in the briefest form. He also says "before the god"; "by Shamash and the king"; "by Marduk, god of Baby-

lon"; "by Shamash, Aja (his wife), by the king, by the city Sippar."

There is no detailed description of court procedure found in any early documents of Babylonia or the ancient Near East. But the safeguards thrown around such governmental proceedings made them effective social and economic factors in early Babylonian life. The results of their activities reveal an efficiency and competence that bespeaks hearty coöperation on the part of spiritual and civil authorities. The deciding judges consisted at times of the elders of a city (Kohler & Ungnad, 1194), of the mayor of a city with eight judges sitting *en banc* (K U, 1195); or of several judges sitting with a military officer as foreman (K U, 1197).

Some of the trials came to an abrupt ending by the use of the most sacred and fearful oath known in that day—called in old law terms the oath of purgation. There are at least six such cases mentioned in the laws of Hammurabi, where the accused by resorting to that oath was set scot-free. Here they are:

§ 20. "If a slave escape from the hand of his captor, and that man swear by the god to the owner of the slave, he shall go free."

§ 103. "If, when an agent has gone on a journey, an enemy rob him of whatever he was carrying, the agent shall swear by the name of the god, and shall go free."

§ 131. "If a man have accused his wife [of infidelity] and she has not been [caught in the act] she shall take an oath in the name of the god and she shall return to her house."

§ 206. "If a man have struck a man in a quarrel and have injured him, he shall swear, 'I did not strike him maliciously,' and he shall be responsible for the doctor[']s fees."

§ 227. "If a man have deceived a brander, and have caused him to mutilate a slave's mark, they shall put that man to death and bury him in his house. The brander shall swear, 'Ignorantly I branded him,' and shall go free."

§ 249. "If a man have hired an ox, and the god have struck it down and it have died, the man who hired the ox shall swear before the god and go free."

These are six cases where the oath freed the accused without further ado. These records, however, are only a fraction of what

took place. In each instance, the plaintiff and the accused appeared before a formal court, either in the temple or other tribunal, with judge or judges, priest or priests, and probably witnesses. After an elaborate examination and pleadings on the part of the two opposing contestants, the accused suddenly requested that he be allowed to take the formal oath of innocence. The officiating priest administered the *mamîtu* and the accused was thereby set free. The sanctity of the oath thus taken was so great that the case was immediately dropped and the court adjourned. In some cases the victor was required to swear that this ended the matter. Such an oath was sworn by the chief god or gods of the city, by the ruling king, and sometimes, by the city itself.

When we turn to the Old Testament we find two words for oath whose fundamental meanings are akin to those of early Babylonia.

1. *'ālā(h)* (𐎠𐎵𐎶), "oath," rather "curse," self-invoked; Sept. ἀπά, Vulg. *maledictio*; translated in our Bibles sometimes "oath" (Gen. 24. 41), sometimes "curse" (Deut. 29. 19, 20). In Num. 5. 27 where a woman's status is tested by an ordeal, if found guilty she shall become *l'ālā(h)* (𐎠𐎵𐎶𐎵) 'a curse' or 'an execration' among her people. In Jer. 29. 18, those who remain in Judea shall be an 'execration' among all the nations. Jer. 42. 18 specifies that in flight to Egypt after the killing of Gedaliah, "ye shall be an execration, and an astonishment and a curse" (see also 44. 12).

2. *sh'bhû'ā(h)* "oath," *nishbā'* "swear," assert the honesty of one's motives, the truth of his words. *Hiphil*, "cause to swear," "take an oath," "adjure." In the use of *'ālā(h)* an imprecation was always lurking in the background ready to spring upon the violator of the oath; in *sh'bhû'ā(h)* there need be none, though in some instances there may have been.

Of the various acts and rituals performed in the making of a covenant, which usually included an oath, the most impressive is that described in Gen. 15 where Abram in his pact with Jahweh cut the animals in two, setting the halves opposite each other, symbolizing the fate of the breaker of the covenant; also interpreted in Jer. 34. 18-20 as a symbol of the death that awaited those who should violate their covenant originally made by passing between the two halves of the slain animals. In other words, the sanctity

of their covenant involving an oath with a curse attached thereto was expressed by a threat of the loss of their lives if violated.

An oath was also consummated by the lifting up of the hand to heaven (Gen. 14. 22), or by the lifting up of both hands (Dan. 12. 7). But I am not to treat the oath in general in the Old Testament; that has been done often and well. My task is limited to a few sample cases of actual or implied court procedure.

Probably the oldest and most Hammurabi-like proceedings are those found in the Little Book of the Covenant (Exodus 21-23). But here, as in Hammurabi, the barest facts are given, leaving the reader to imagine the processes through which the trials travelled. E. g., if two men quarrel and injure the one's wife . . . he shall pay as the judges determine (Exod. 21. 22). In other words, we have here merely the echo of a full trial at court, where the entire circumstances of the quarrel were aired, fought out by argument and pleas, taken in consideration by the judges, and decided. But our interest centers rather in those trials where the oath was invoked by the accused. In Exod. 22. 7-9 the defaulter who could not account for the goods on deposit was arraigned in court on charges of theft, thoroughly examined by judges and testified against by witnesses in the presence of a full quota of priests. Each party was obliged to face the taking of the oath and to swear by the severest of oaths. In case no guilt could be proved the judges freed the accused. But in the next example (Exod. 22. 10, 11) where a herdsman took over several kinds of stock for safekeeping and some of them disappeared, there being no witnesses, the trial finally broke down and was dropped when he resorted to the "oath of Jahweh," the oath of purgation, which was accepted as final, and he made no restitution for the loss. Doughty (*Arabia Deserta*, I, 267) found the same custom among the Arabs today. This is similar to the six oaths of purgation already cited in Hammurabi, where the taking of that oath acquitted the accused and closed the trials. In other words, a denial on oath became an acquittal. The sacredness of the oath was sufficient to allay all suspicions as to the possible guilt of the accused.

The oath in all that area of the Semitic world seems to have lost little or none of its sanctity and terror for more than 1500 years. This is amply illustrated by the well-known concrete case dating

from the time of Ashur-nirari V (753-745 B. C.), about the time of Amos in Israel. In a sworn treaty between that Assyrian king and Mati'ilu of Agusi a ram was slain, and his body cut into pieces, and set aside as symbolic of a possible broken contract. The symbolic meaning was thus emphasized at the treaty-making: 'This [detached] head is not the head of the ram, but that of Mati'ilu, of his sons, of his nobles, and of the people of the land.' 'If Mati'ilu violates this oath, just as the head of the ram is cut off, so will the head of Mati'ilu be cut off.' The same symbolic process was amplified touching all the detached parts of the ram's body. After calling on several divinities, and invoking several highly significant curses and threats against his family, his flocks, and his people, we see most clearly that a violated oath in the eighth century B. C. meant the extinction of the false-swearer.

The Deuteronomic legislation (17. 8) makes some specific provisions for cases that were too difficult for the local courts or judges. In these we find cases between blood and blood (whether manslaughter or murder) between plea and plea (whether larceny or embezzlement) and between stroke and stroke (some personal injury), being trials held at the gates remaining undecided.

Such unsettled cases should be carried up to the central tribunal or court, and come up before the Levitical priests and the judge, of course with all the required witnesses and attendant officers. The text says merely this, "and thou shalt inquire, and they shall show thee the sentence of judgment" (vs. 9),—an inadequate and fragmentary method of reporting what must have been trials involving all the elaborations, testimony, pleadings, and oaths required at such tribunals. In this case the judgment or sentence might have been death if the party were found guilty.

In Deuteronomy 19. 15 ff. we have a case not uncommon in the Near East. A false witness appears against someone for personal ends, in this case leading to the re-affirmation of the fundamental principle that only at the mouth of two witnesses shall any case be established (cf. Jezebel's charge against Naboth (for his vineyard), where she used the same sound principle to make sure of the decision in her favor (I Kings, 21. 1-16). In the Deuteronomy case the accuser and the accused took their stand before Jahweh, i. e., they were put under oath in the presence of priests and judges.

After thorough examination and cross-examination the testimony of the accuser broke down, and the decision, of course, went against him. In this, as in a long line of items in Hammurabi and Exodus, the penalty was *lex talionis*; the penalty which he endeavored to foist upon his victim fell upon his own head.

In Jeremiah (34. 18-20) the significance of the oath as embodied in a covenant between God and man was still distressingly vivid. Its violation meant falling into the hands of enemies and the suffering of a violent death.

Taking then the sweep of our earliest records of Babylonia down almost through the Old Testament we find the pledged oath accompanied with a curse, as the final resort to curb evil-doers and to rescue the innocent under false accusation. Based upon a religious belief, it seems to have been the most effective measure of restraining society, and of stabilizing the civil and economic activities of peoples whose religious and moral force alone were not equal to their daily tests.

The fundamental meanings of the oaths used in the early courts of Babylonia and the Old Testament are transparently clear in their derivations. The most effective was the pledged-promise that carried with it a curse upon the maker if he violated the specified terms of the oath. This last-resort oath was sufficient in most cases to acquit the accused and bring the trial to an end. Its salutary effect is found in Old Testament court procedure down to the exile, as a stabilizing factor in the religious, social, and economic structure of the Semitic peoples.

TWO ONOMATOLOGICAL STUDIES

ISRAEL EITAN

PITTSBURGH, PA.

1. *The Name Eve*

The interpretation of חַוָּה in Gen. 3. 20 as "the mother of all *living*" is generally understood to derive this name from the root of חָי, as if חַוָּה = חַיָּה "life." Such a derivation is most often taken by modern scholars to represent no more than a popular etymology—and for good reasons. First, the popular imagination of the ancients would certainly have found for the first woman in human history some more concrete and precise characterization than an abstract name as general and comprehensive as Life, suitable only to Mankind. Secondly, as the root for "life" in Hebrew and in the cognate languages is one with second *yod*, the above identification would necessarily imply חַוָּה—with *waw*—to represent a secondary formation of later origin. Such an implication can hardly seem reasonable when referring to an old tradition and, moreover, while all the other vocables of the same word-family—חָי, חַיָּה, יַחַיִּים v. חַיָּה—have preserved the original *yod*.

Other identifications have then been suggested. Midrash Rabba, among other *homiletic* interpretations, connects חַוָּה with Aram. חוּיָא "serpent,"¹ cf. also Arab. *hayyatun*. In our own time Noeldeke and Wellhausen² took up the same etymology for good, believing to find in that name a trace of an antique tradition putting the serpent at the head of the genealogy of the human race. The above Midrashic derivation is also advocated by Ehrlich,³ although for another reason. So far, however, no concrete proofs have been adduced to substantiate the strange identification of

¹ See Gen. Rabba, sect. 20, 27: וּמֵיַעֲצָתוֹ כְּחוּיָא "and she advises him like a serpent." Also: חוּיָא חַיִּיךְ וְאַתָּה הוּיָא דְאָדָם "the serpent was a serpent to thee, but thou wast Adam's serpent." Cf. *ibidem.*, sect. 22, 2.

² *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, English translation, 1885, Edinburgh; see p. 308, n. 1.

³ *Randglossen*, Vol. I, p. 16.

תָּוָה with "serpent" to any degree of probability. Neither could Robertson Smith's⁴ interpretation of כָּל-חַי as "every *hayy*" (= *hayy*^u, "kinsfolk, tribe, clan")—even if correct—be supposed to indicate the real etymology under discussion.

Now it is worth noticing that the very use of the word חַי in our verse has something peculiar and of an accidental character. Its connotation is evidently narrowed down to "mankind" only, cf. Targum, כְּנִי אֲנִשָּׁא. But then, חַי seems to represent a mere makeshift for אִמָּה, the use of which would have been quite inconvenient here, the sentence having already started with וַיִּקְרָא הָאָדָם. This becomes still likelier if we take into account the fondness shown by ancient Hebrew for *assonance* as that offered here by חַי and תָּוָה.

The purpose, however, of our verse was not—as hitherto assumed by all commentators—to specify the root or word from which תָּוָה was derived. The author merely intended to convey—more or less free-handedly—the etymological *meaning* of that name as "mother of all mankind." This appellation presents the most natural and adequate characterization of the first woman in human history and, moreover, recalls classical epithets given on similar mythological occasions. Compare, e. g., Vergil's "*magna deum genetrix*" = the goddess Cybele, called also *Magna Mater*; or Ovid's figurative "*genetrix frugum*" = the goddess Ceres. Our "mother of all mankind" might then eventually point to the genuine etymology by laying the emphasis on אִמָּה "mother" as a *synonym* of תָּוָה.

Now תָּוָה, indeed, seems to represent an archaic Hebrew equivalent of the above Latin *genetrix*, "one who *brings forth*, or *bears*, a mother," or figuratively "one who produces." As it can properly be derived only from a root with second *waw*, the crux will apparently vanish if we identify תָּוָה with Arab. *hawā* "to bring forth" (woman), cf. also *hawiya* "to be delivered" (woman) or *hawī* "empty-bellied." The same root חוה with a hard ח *h* is further to be traced in Ex. 1. 19, כִּי חָיוֹת הָנָה which is

⁴ *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia*, p. 177.

perfectly well explained by the context וַיִּלְדָּה. Here obviously belongs also Mishnic and Aram. חַיָּה "a lying-in woman," cf. above intrans. *hawiya* "to be delivered." Mishn. and Aram. חַיָּה "midwife" might then be derived from the transitive form *hawā* "to bring forth" with regard to another woman's child. Cf. Heb. יָלַד when speaking of the father. The last three vocables with *yod*—wrongly connected by the Lexica with חַיָּה "to live"—are, of course, of later formation than חַיָּה which has preserved the original *waw* of the second radical.

As to the nominal type after which חַיָּה has been formed, it might represent either a feminine segolate, i. e. חַיָּה < *חַיָּה, cf. מַלְכָּה, or perhaps better a feminine *nomen agentis*, i. e. חַיָּה < *חַיָּה, cf. רַקְחוֹת, מַבְכְּחוֹת I Sam. 8. 13.

2. The Name Abraham

As in the case of the above Biblical derivation of חַיָּה "Eve," the very nature of the explanation given in Gen. 17. 5 for the name Abraham is generally misconceived as an attempt to trace this name from the words אִבְרָהִים. The verse is then considered to offer a mere word-play, insufficient even for a "popular etymology" as it does not account for the consonant ר in אִבְרָהִים at all. Ibn Ezra (12th cent.) was the first to insist on this latter shortcoming, proposing the etymology אִבְרָהִים הַמִּין which in our own time was taken up again by Dillmann and Joseph Halévy.⁵ Most scholars, however, identify etymologically אִבְרָהִים and אִבְרָם as one and the same name. Of these some believe the additional ה to have originated here as a mere *litera prolongationis* or vowel-letter which finally came to be pronounced as an independent consonant: Abrahám < Abrahm < Abrahm. So G. R. Driver⁶ and Montgomery,⁷ after Hommel and Cowley. Others

⁵ *REJ.*, 1887, 177 f.

⁶ *JBL.*, Vol. 45, 323-5.

⁷ *JBL.*, Vol. 46, 144.

consider אברהם as an Aramaizing equivalent of אברם "exalted father" from אב + רום, cf. Aram. רהט for Heb. ריוץ, Aram. כרה for Heb. כוש, etc.

The following lines make an individual refutation of each of the foregoing derivations of אברהם quite superfluous. In reality, the Biblical verse in question points to the etymology of that name not by specifying the roots from which it might have originated—but by indicating the *semantic* value of the two components of אברהם. The author simply wants to say that Abraham means אבהמון "father of a multitude." Now this looks rather correct. For, as the first member אב of that name can hardly be doubted, the second רהם seems best to represent the archaic Hebrew counterpart of *ruhām*⁸ which in Arabic⁸ actually means "great number" or "multitude" = רמון. Furthermore, this interpretation of אברהם as "father of a multitude" (or "a great number" of . . .) proves to be more than a superficial or "popular etymology," since it permits to identify Abū-Ruhām, a personal name preserved in the Ḥadīth, as the Arabic counterpart of the Hebrew name Abraham. Obviously a name or cognomen like Abū-Ruhām, too, was originally used to characterize a man as the head of an exceptionally large family, or populous clan or tribe.

The two forms אברם and אברהם must then represent two etymologically different names, the first and earlier one apparently of Babylonian origin, the second and later one of Western—Canaanitish or Amoritic—extraction. As to the question of the possible bearing such a difference of origin of the two names might have on the very history of the Biblical traditions relating to the patriarch, it exceeds the limits and the purpose of the present study.

⁸ Lane, III, p. 1172.

ON TURFAN PAHLAVI *MIYAZDAGTĀČĪH*, AS DESIGNATING A MANICHAEAN CEREMONIAL OFFERING¹

A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

AMONG the fragmentary remains of Mānī's writings in Middle Persian, which were recovered through the remarkable finds made by A. von Le Coq in the Turfan Oasis of Eastern Turkistan, and were first deciphered and translated by F. W. K. Müller in 1904, there are a couple of incomplete remnants from Mānī's *Evangeliyōn* (au(a)ng(a)lyv n), or Gospel.² The existence of this work was well known to the Church Fathers and is referred to by al-Bērūnī and others.³

The scrap of one such text, which here concerns us because it contains the TPhl. word *miyazdagtāčh* under consideration, consists of a single leaf, numbered *Fragm. M. 17* in Müller, *Handschriften-reste*, 2. 25-27. Its reverse side, where this term is found, bears in blue ink the caption heading *Evangeliyōnīg* (au(a)ng(a)lyv n y g), thus proving it to be 'Belonging to [Mānī's] Gospel.' This attribution is further assured by the fact that just a few lines above the excerpt to be quoted there occur (written in red ink) the words: 'I, Mānī, the Apostle of Jesus',⁴—a title which he assumed according to Saint Augustine.⁵ With regard to the content of the brief Fragment as a whole we need simply note that it comprises an ascription of praise and, towards the end of the second column of the second page, an allusion to the ritual offering in question, the latter text being also incomplete.

¹ Presented by title at the annual meeting of the A. O. S. at Philadelphia, April 9, 1926, but now printed for the first time.

² See F. W. K. Müller, *Handschriften-reste*, 2. 26-27, and his remarks, which include an allusion to a Petersburg Fragment; also p. 30-31 bottom and p. 101 bottom. Likewise see C. Salemann, *Ein Bruchstück*, p. 2. 4-5. Furthermore, compare P. Alfarić, *Les Écritures manichéennes*, 2. 38, n. 1.

³ For references see Alfarić, *op. cit.* 2. 37-43.

⁴ The TPhl. words here are, 'an Mānī prēstag 'ig Yīšō'; see Müller, *op. cit.*, p. 26 bottom.

⁵ See Aug. *Contra Faustum*, 13. 4; cf. id. *Epist. Fund.* 5. 6.

These incomplete verses at the end may be transliterated and translated as follows (cf. Mü. *op. cit.* p. 27):

farūzān 'in
miyazdagtāčih
padirēnd zirān
āšnāsēnd o o
ṭahmān pēmōčēnd
*dānagān vaḥi*⁶

(remainder missing)

'The Blessed Ones this

miyazdagtāčih

will receive; the Wise Ones

will recognize it o o

the Strong Ones will clothe (*i. e.* with the heavenly robe)

the goodness (or wisdom) of those 'Who are Knowing'

(*i. e.* the Elect).

(The rest is lost)

Two observations on this passage may at once be made: (1) the long word *miyazdagtāčih*, which is left for the moment untranslated, looks like a compound; (2) the context clearly indicates that this term designates some kind of pious offering in the Manichaean ritual which will be acceptable to the divine beings in the realms beyond.

Regarding the correct reading of *miyazdagtāčih* (*myzdg-tacyh*) in the text there can be no question. It is similarly written in the later-published TPhl. Fragment S. 12c, 51 (Salemman, *Manichaica*, 3. p. 17), where the imperfect or obliterated text breaks off just after *hān miyazdagtāčih*. Added weight is lent also by the fact that in another torn Fragment (S. 41b, 2), from the same Petrograd or Leningrad collection, the broken word *myazdag* / / / / is surely to be filled out as *miyazdag(tāčih)*. We may therefore rest assured that the decipherment of the term is certain. Moreover, the first element *miyazdag* is found by itself alone in M. 176v, line 15—Mü. 2. p. 62 top.

⁶ It would probably be premature to try to recognize some of the Old Iranian octosyllabic rhythm in the lilt of these truncated lines, or in those which immediately precede them in this imperfectly preserved Fragment.

This noun *miyazdagtāčih*, as already intimated, is a derivative abstract of compound origin, and is to be resolved into *miyazdag* + *tāčih*, the first half of which presents no difficulty.

Every Iranist recognized at once when the Turfan Fragments were first made accessible, that TPhl. *miyazdag* was to be connected with Av. *myazda-*, Skt. *miyédha-*, Book Phl. *miyazd*, N. P. *miyazd*, all of these terms being associated with the ceremonial offering and of common Indo-Iranian descent. In the Avesta it is clear that *myazda-* denotes the edible portion of the oblation which was partaken of by the Zoroastrian faithful in the ritual.⁷

All ceremonial offerings, which are partaken of by the worshipper, as in Zoroastrianism and elsewhere, consist, however, of drink as well as food. This fact furnishes us with the key for solving the riddle of the second element (*-tāčih*) of our compound, which seems hitherto to have failed of explanation.⁸ A derivation for the vocable is easy to suggest in the light of what has just been said. The substantive *-tāčih* (with the abstract suffix *ih*, which belongs to the whole 'dvandva' compound) is a Middle-Iranian derivative from the familiar Indo-Iranian root *tač*, 'to flow, run', applied especially to something that is liquid.⁹ It must therefore have denoted the fluid portion of the oblation; the two elements together made up the complete offering, *miyazdag-tāčih*, somewhat as do the bread and wine in the Christian eucharist.

In connection with the Manichaean ceremony, though with a difference to be pointed out below, we may first recall that the

⁷ See Bartholomae, *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*, 1191, s. v. *myazda-*, as referring to the solid portion of the offering in contradistinction to the liquid portion, *zaoθra-* (*op cit.* 1654-1655).

⁸ No explanation of *miyazdagtāčih* is offered, for example, by Müller, *Handschriften-reste*, 2. 27, who simply gives 'Opfer . . .' Andreas (in a note in Müller, *op. cit.* p. 111) translates by 'Opferdarbringung,' but without adding a comment. Salemann, *Manichäische Studien*, p. 95, merely has 'vgl. *miyazdag-?*'. W. Bang, *Muséon*, 36. 223-225 (cf. *Muséon*, 37. 112) treats of *miyazdag* but leaves '*tāč(?)ih*' with a question mark.

⁹ See Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 624-625. The long *ā* in *tāčih* is to be explained as of causative or denominative origin; the form may be compared with Bk. Phl. *tāčīšn-ōmand*, which is used to translate Av. *vitāčīna-* in Vd. 15. 14; see Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 1440, and cf. Salemann, in *Grundr. d. iran. Philologie*, I. 1, p. 298 § 87. For instances of Phl. *ā* = Av. or Skt. *ā* consult Hübschmann, *Pers. Stud.* p. 133 top.



A MANICHAEAN CEREMONIAL OFFERING.

(Reproduced from a colored plate in A. von Le Coq, *Die Manichäische Miniaturen*, Plate 8^e)

Zoroastrian ritual in an age far more ancient comprised an offering of the stimulating juice extracted from the *haoma* plant (Vedic *sóma*), together with consecrated water, milk, cakes, some flesh food (later omitted), sweet-smelling wood for burning, and other ceremonial elements. The Modern Zoroastrians have retained these characteristic elements but have wholly eliminated animal flesh from the offering, substituting *ghee*, or clarified butter. The Parsi ritual will be found best described by Dr. Jivanji Jamshadji Modi, in his *Religious Ceremonies of the Parsees*, p. 391-394, cf. also p. 260-329, Bombay, 1922. It comprises the offering of fruit, flowers, together with the *darūn* or sacred bread (cf. p. 296-299), all placed on one tray, and of milk, wine, water, *sherbet* (or syrup) in vessels or glasses on another tray. With regard to wine, Modi records (p. 394): 'There are some Parsees now, who, being total abstainers, abstain from using wine at their place. If we look to the time of the Avesta, we find no prohibition.'

Keeping in mind the fact that Mānī was totally opposed to any indulgence in wine by those who followed his religion, and utterly forbade the taking of animal life, we may now further illustrate the meaning proposed above for *miyazdag-tāčih* by turning to the broken mural painting brought back from Eastern Turkistan by Professor A. von Le Coq.¹⁰ This noted scholarly authority rightly recognized that the painting depicts a Manichaean offering (*op. cit.* p. 54).

Following in general Le Coq's excellent description of the scene portrayed, but with additions and some comments, we can see plainly delineated in color in the middle of the painting, first (1) what I would designate as the *miyazdag*, or that portion of the oblation which is to be partaken of as food in the ritual.¹¹

¹⁰ Le Coq, *Die buddhistische Spätantike in Mittelasien. Zweiter Teil: Die manichäische Miniaturen*, Berlin, 1923. See Plate 8b, and cf. p. 53-55.

¹¹ I may note that this entire paragraph was originally drafted in December, 1924, after receiving the Le Coq volume a month earlier, on November 4th of that year, and studying this particular miniature, which appears to represent the Bema festival as Le Coq suggested (*op. cit.* p. 53-54). The view which I recorded at that time as to *miyazdag* and *drōn*, and also regarding *-tāčih*, was found subsequently to receive independent and welcome support through Professor Bang's short article in *Muséon* (1924), 37. 111-112, already referred to in note 8, so far as the

Here on a tray resting upon a table in the foreground we see depicted a dozen small round cakes of white bread, which would correspond in a measure to the *drōn* (*darūn*) wafers in the old Zoroastrian sacrifice.¹² Next, in the immediate background above, there stand the Manichaean fruit and vegetable offerings in a golden tripod dish. The lower layer of these gifts consists of yellowish melons as peculiarly consecrated to the Elect. The second shows bunches of grapes, white among purple. The top is crowned by what Le Coq queried as being 'eine grüne Melone(?)'. This green object, however, is not a melon at all but a rich green 'cucumber', which peeps out above from the cluster, being thrust down through it into the melons. For such an explanation we have the full support of Saint Augustine, who refers especially to 'melons and cucumbers' (*melones et cucumeres*) as the appropriate food of the Elect.¹³ Flowers, we know also, were much used by the Manichaeans, and these likewise appear to be discernible in a golden dish standing upon the remains of a wooden settle in front of the table.¹⁴ We may feel certain, therefore, regarding the *miyazdag* elements represented in the painting.

two former were concerned, although he had no explanation to offer for *-tāčih*. The derivation suggested above would seem to clear up that question.

¹² Similarly, as with the other Manichaean oblations, the Elect could eat bread as consecrated sustenance, if it was presented as an offering of the Auditores. See Theodoret, *Haeret. Fab. Compendium*, I. 28, ed. Migne, *Patr. Gr.* vol. 83, col. 380 C, as I have indicated in *JAOS* 45. 257.

¹³ Augustine, *Contra Faustum*, 5. 10; cf. 6. 4, 8. See also among the anathemas ascribed to Augustine, Migne, *P.* 42, col. 1155, Anathema iii (printed also in *op. cit.*, vol. 65, col. 24). For a translation of these anathemas see Joseph Rickaby, S. J., *The Manichees as Saint Augustine saw them*, p. 9-11, London, 1925. [In letters which Le Coq and I exchanged (Aug. 1928) after this article had been accepted for printing, he wrote me that he was attracted by my suggestion to include St. Augustine's 'cucumbers'; he had thought only of the 'delicious melons' which he had enjoyed when in Eastern Turkistan. This would lend support for my interpretation of the particular object pictured in the fresco.]

¹⁴ See Le Coq, *op. cit.* p. 54, near bottom: 'Vor dem Tisch scheint noch ein Holzschemel oder dergl. gestanden zu haben, neben dem nach I. eine goldene Schale mit weiss und gelblichen Blumen z. T. noch erkennbar ist.' We may remark that Le Coq (cf. p. 34, n. 2) always uses right and left from the standpoint of the figures in the picture, and not from the viewpoint of the observer.

The *tāčih* element, or libation portion of the offering, also receives confirmation through the picture. This latter I judge to be furnished by the upper part of a handsome golden pitcher which is recognizable to the left of the table, and which Le Coq regards as of Sasanian form.¹⁵ Its contents, we may be sure, consisted of nothing stronger than fruit juice or sherbet.

We may now conclude that the explanation proposed above for the word *miyazdagtāčih* in the Manichaean ritual, as referring to the offerings of food and drink, respectively, has support alike from the standpoint of etymology and that of representation in art.

¹⁵ Le Coq, *loc. cit.* 'Nach r. dagegen, neben dem Tisch, sieht man noch den oberen Teil einer prachtvollen goldenen Kanne sassanidischer Form. Ähnliche übernommene Formen finden sich bei chinesischen Metallgefäßen.' Merely incidentally, I may add that the picture furthermore shows in the hands of the chief offerer an object which I take to be a book.

STUDIES IN THE DIVYĀVADĀNA

JAMES R. WARE
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

II. *Dānādhikāramahāyānasūtra*.¹

INTRODUCTION

Skt. Honor to the three jewels. Thus have I heard: One time the Blessed One was at Śrāvastī in the Jetavana, the grove of Anāthapiṇḍada, with a large group of monks. There he addressed the monks: Monks, a wise man gives a gift in 37 ways.

Tib. Honor to all the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas. Thus did I hear at one time: The Blessed One was at Śrāvastī in the grove of Anāthapiṇḍada, the Jetavana. Thereupon the Blessed One said to the monks: Monks, wise men give a gift in 37 ways. If it is asked what the 37 are:

Chin. Thus have I heard: One time when the Buddha was at Śrāvastī in the Jetavana, the park of Anāthapiṇḍada, with a large number of monks, he related the doctrine of gifts. There are 37 kinds.

¹ For a study of the *Sūkarikāvadāna* see JAOS 48. 159-165. In the following article I have confronted English translations of the Sanskrit, Tibetan, and Chinese versions of the *Dānādhikāramahāyānasūtra*. A complete translation is given of the Skt. and Chin. texts, but the Tib. is given only when it varies from the Skt., for, as a rule, the Tib. texts translate literally, whereas the Chin. translate freely or even paraphrase their original.

The Tib. text is to be found in mdo 15, ff. 151 a (line 5)—153 a (line 4); the Chin. in the Tokyo edition of the Tripiṭaka XIV. 8. 3 a and in Taisho Issai-kyo XVI. 812. The Skt. text is to be found in Cowell and Neil's edition of the Divyāvadāna, pp. 481-483.

M. Przyluski, in correspondence which I have had with him since leaving France, has called my attention to the ms. 98 of the Skt. collection at the Bibliothèque Nationale, but I have not tried to obtain a loan of it. Cowell and Neil (*op. cit.*) briefly describe it and merely remark (p. 667) that the *Dānādhikāra*° there found = the *Dānādhikāra*° of the *Divyā*°.

As the original Tib. is not easily accessible to all, I have decided to give the complete text in the notes.

Intro. Sañs-rgyas dañ byañ-chub-sems-dpañ thams-cad-la phyag-ñtshal-lo. Īdi-skad bdag-gas thos-pa dus gcig-na. Bcom-ldan-ñdas mñan-yod-na rgyal-bu rgyal-byed-kyi tshal ngon-med zas-sbyin-gyi kun-dgañ ra-ba-na bshugs-te. De-nas bcom-ldan-ñdas-kyis dge-sloñ-rnams-la bkañ-stsal-pa. Dge-sloñ-dag mkhas-pa-rnams-kyis rnam-pa sum-cu-rtsa-bdun sbyin-pa byin-no. Sum-cu-rtsa-bdun gañ she-na.

1.

Skt. Missing.

Tib. To be freed of avarice, a gift is given with faith.

Chin. When with true and respectful heart a gift is made, one must needs obtain freedom from all desires for the things which men reverence.

1. Ser-sna rnam-par-spañ-bañi phyir dad-pas sbyin-pa byin-no.

2.

Skt. He gives a gift at the right time. He gives a gift approved by the Tathāgata and suitable. The *trivastu* is completely purified.

Tib. At the right time a gift is given. A gift approved by the Tathāgata and suitable is given that the *trivastu* be completely purified.

Chin. When a gift is made at the right time, one obtains the purification of the *trivastu*, and tranquility and contentment during the four seasons of the year.

2. Dus-su sbyin-pa byin no. De-bshin-gcegs-pas gnañ-pañi ruñ-pa ñños-po gsum yoñs-su dag-par sbyin-pa byin-no.

On p. 681 of their text Cowell and Neil suggest that *trivastu* means *buddha*, *dharma*, *saṃgha*. The true meaning, however, is "thot, word, and deed." Cf. Ting Fu-pao's (丁福保) translation of Oda's Buddhist dictionary, 佛學大辭典 (Shanghai 1925), p. 337 中 and p. 2342 下.

3.

Skt. He gives a gift with respect, to dispel all faults and perplexities.

Chin. By giving constantly one obtains undispersed happiness of body and mind, and the disappearance of confusion.

3. Sems-kyi ħkhrug-pañi skyon thams-cad spañ-pañi phyir bsti-stañ-du byas-te sbyin-pa byin-no.

4.

Skt. He gives a gift with his own hand, to obtain excellence from a body without excellence.

Chin. By giving with one's own hand one obtains long, thin fingers and correctness in personal appearance.

4. *Sñiñ-po med-paḥi lus-las sñiñ-po blañ-paḥi phyir rañ-gi lag-nas sbyin-pa byin-no.*

5.

Skt. He gives a *skandha* as a gift, which is conducive to obtaining in return the enjoyment of the great renunciation as the fruit of the act.

Tib. When a gift non-injurious to others is given, one obtains the great renunciation as the fruit of the act.

Chin. By giving a gift for others one obtains the bestowal of the great renunciation from the activities of other men.

5. *Skandham dānaṃ dadāti mahātyāgabhogavipākapratilābhasaṃvar-tanīyaṃ.*

Gshan-la mi gnod-paḥi sbyin-pa byin-na rnam-par smin-pa gtoñ-ba chen-po thob-par ḥgyur-ro.

爲他施復得他人行大捨施。

It is evident from the Tib. and Chin. that we must seek for the original *Skt.* a reading other than the *skandha* of the present text which is here meaningless. I would suggest, therefore, that the original text read **anyadānaṃ*. The Tib. and Chin. have both interpreted this reading. As for the present *Skt.* text, perhaps its history is as follows: *anyadānaṃ > anyam dānaṃ > skandham dānaṃ* as the result of a poorly written manuscript. It seems to me that such a confusion might easily arise if devanāgarī characters were used, but, of course, we must remember that the archetype of the mss. which Cowell and Neil used is in Nepalese script, and I confess that it seems less easy in that script.

The Chin. here inserts a "way" found neither in the *Skt.* nor the Tib.: By a gift conforming to the teaching (of Buddha), the mind abandons attachments and obtains eternal happiness.

6.

Skt. He gives a gift of excellent color which is conducive to obtaining in return (we must read °*pratilābhasaṃ*°) beauty as the fruit of the act.

Chin. By a gift of an article of excellent color one obtains an

upright and imposing complexion, and the things which all like and take pleasure in.

6. Kha-dog phun-sum-tshogs-par sbyin-pa byin-na rnam-par smin-pa kha-dog mdses-pa thob-par hgyur-ro.

7.

Skt. . . . a gift of excellent fragrance which is conducive to obtaining in return as the fruit of the act fragrance.

Chin. . . . an article of extremely good fragrance one obtains permanent possession of sandal-wood-incense which is a means of furnishing support (to the saṃgha).

7. Dri phun-sum-tshogs-paḥi . . . grags-paḥi dri . . .

8.

Skt. . . . of excellent flavor . . . the marks of the foremost excellent flavors.

Chin. . . . of excellent flavor one obtains to have his limbs and body filled and benefited by the best of flavors.

8. Ro bro-ba phun-sum-tshogs-paḥi . . . ro bro-paḥi mchog-gis dpe-byad bzañ-po . . .

9.²

Skt. . . . perfect gift . . . perfect enjoyment.

Chin. If the gift is held in honor and esteem by the Law . . . tranquility and contentment, and the things which all men behold with joy.

9. Gya-nom-paḥi . . . loñs-spyod gya-nom-pa . . .

10.

Skt. . . . extensive gift . . . extensive enjoyment.

Chin. By a liberal gift . . . extensive happiness without limit.

10. Rgya-chen-po . . . loñs-spyod rgya-chen-po . . .

11.

Skt. . . . of food . . . freedom from hunger-desire.

Chin. . . . of choice food . . . freedom from hunger and famine, and that his granary be full and overflowing.

11. Bzañ-ba . . . tshe-rabs thams-cad-du bkres-pa rnam-par gcod-pa . . .

* The suggestions of the editor, Professor F. Edgerton, have helped me to what I believe is the correct interpretation of nos. 9 and 10.

12.

Skt. . . . of drink . . . freedom from thirst everywhere in his rebirths.

Chin. . . . of broth and drink . . . freedom from all thirst wherever one may go.

12. Btuñ-ba . . . tshe-rabs thams-cad-du skom-pa rnam-par geod-pa . . .

13.

Skt. . . . of clothes . . . enjoyment of abundant clothes.

Chin. . . . of clothes . . . quite excellent clothes and an imposing personal appearance.

13. Bgo-ba . . . gos-kyi loñs-spyod sna-tshogs . . .

14.

Skt. . . . a house . . . a distinguished palatial residence, upper apartment, gallery, dwelling, mansion, royal garden, or grove.

Tib. When a shelter is given as a gift, one obtains as the fruit of the act an upper story, a storeyed-house, a gallery, a dwelling, a mansion, a royal garden, and a grove as abiding place.

Chin. . . . of a residence . . . an extensive field and house, and an imposing two-storeyed house and a hall.

14. Pratiśrayaṃ dānaṃ dadāti harṃyakūtāgaraprāsādabhavanavimāno-
dyānārāmaṃviśeṣavipākapratiḷābhasaṃvartaniyaṃ.

Gnas . . . pu-çu dañ khañ-pa-brtsegs-pa dañ khyams dañ khoñ-pa dañ
gshal-med-khañ dañ bskyed-mos-tshal dañ kun-dgañ-ra-ba dañ yul . . .

以住處施。得田宅寬廣樓閣莊嚴。

Corresponding to the *viśeṣa* of the *Skt.* the *Tib.* has *yul* = *viśaya*. The *Tib.* reading is certainly secondary.

15.

Skt. . . . a bed . . . a family of the upper class.

Chin. . . . of a bed . . . birth in an honorable family and the possession of bright, clean furniture.

15. Mal-cha . . . rigs mthon-po . . .

16.

Skt. . . . a vehicle . . . the steps to magic.

Tib. When a vehicle is given . . . the four steps to magic.

Chin. . . . of an elephant, horse, wagon, or palanquin . . . the four steps to magic, which are very useful for not being caught (?) in a crowd.

16. Yānaṃ . . . ṛddhipādavi°.

Bshon-pa . . . rdsu-ḥphrul-gyi rkañ-pa bshi . . .

以象馬車輦施。得四神足無擁妙用。

The original text undoubtedly read *caturṛddhipāda*°. These four steps seem to have been the abandonment of *chanda*, *citta*, *vīrya*, and *mīmāṃsā*. Cf. E. J. Eitel, *Hdbk. of Chinese Buddhism*, p. 131, and Sylvain Lévi's edition and translation of the *Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra*, *BEHE* 159, pp. 142-143, and *BEHE* 190, pp. 106 and 239-240.

17.

Skt. . . . medicine . . . freedom from old age and death, freedom from grief, freedom from painful hindrances, and nirvāṇa.

Tib. When medicine . . . a nirvāṇa free from old age, death, grief, and painful hindrances.

Chin. . . . of liquid medicine . . . tranquility, contentment, and freedom from all ailments.

17. Bhāṣajyadānaṃ . . . ajarāmaṇaśokāsaṃkṣiṭṭānirodhanirvāṇavi°.

Sman . . . rga-ḥi med ciñ mya-ñan dañ kun-nas ñon-moñs-pa ḥgog-paḥi mya-ñan-las ḥdas-pa . . .

以湯藥施。得安隱快樂無諸疾病。

The Tib. text presupposes a *Skt.* *ajarāmaṇaśokasaṃkṣiṭṭānirodhanirvāṇa*°. As for the *Skt.* text, my translation clearly indicates that I find no reason to follow Cowell and Neil in their suggested emendation of *nirodha* to *anirodha*.

18.

Skt. . . . a precept as a gift . . . recollection of his former births.

Chin. . . . of a precept to be found in the canon . . . the revelation of his former births.

18. Chos . . . skye-ba dran-par . . .

19.

Skt. . . . of flowers . . . the flower of the branches of enlightenment.

Chin. . . . of flowers and fruit . . . the flower of the seven branches of enlightenment.

19. Me-tog . . . byañ-chub-kyi yan-lag-gi me-tog . . .

According to the *Mahāyānasūtrā*° (*vide supra* 16) 159, p. 57, l. 25; 190, p. 106, l. 17, these branches are: *smṛti*, *dharma-pravicaya*, *vīrya*, *prīti*, *prasrabdhi*, *samādhi*, and *upekṣa*.

20.

Skt. . . . a garland . . . purification from passion, hatred, and ignorance.

Chin. . . . of a garland of flowers, one succeeds in escaping the filth of covetousness, anger, and foolishness.

20. Phreñ-pa . . . ḥdod-chags dañ she-sdañ dañ gti-mug-gi dri-ma rnam-par dag-pa . . .

The *Skt.* here adds: . . . perfume . . . the arising of the pleasure of divine perfumes (for one's personal use).

21.

Skt. . . . incense . . . doing away with vexatious, bad odors.

Chin. . . . of incense . . . to abandon vexing and stinking filth.

21. Bdug-pa . . . ñon-moñs-paḥi dri ña-ba thams-cad med-pa . . .

22.

Skt. . . . parasol . . . overlordship of supremacy in the Law.

Chin. . . . parasol . . . self-sufficiency in the Law.

22. Gdugs . . . chos-la dbaṅ-paḥi dbaṅ-phyug . . .

23.

Skt. . . . bell . . . charming voice.

Chin. Same.

23. Dril-bu . . . sgra-dbyaṅs yid-du ḥoñ-pa . . .

24.

Skt. . . . musical instrument . . . a voice sounding like Brahmā's.

Chin. . . . music . . . a fine, deep voice like Brahmā's.

24. Sil-sñan . . . tshaṅs-paḥi sgra-dbyaṅs lta-bu . . .

25.

Skt. Omitted.

Tib. When a lamp . . . a divine eye, unobscured and clear.

Chin. . . . lighted lamp . . . a divine eye, clear and pure.

25. Mar-me . . . lhaḥi mig sgrib-pa med ciñ rnam-par dag-pa . . .

26.

Skt. . . . silk cloth . . . the binding on of silks used at the consecrations of gods and men.

Tib. When silk cloth . . . the binding on of the silks of release among gods and men.

Chin. . . . silk fabrics consisting of pieces of variegated silk . . . garments of release.

26. Paṭṭa . . . devamanuṣyābhiṣekapaṭṭabandhavi°. (All the *Skt.* mss. read *devamanuṣyo* 'bhiṣeka°.)

Dar . . . lha dañ miḥi nañ-na rnam-par grol-paḥi dar-gyis beñ-pa . . .

以給綵疋帛施得解脫衣服。

Since both the *Tib.* and *Chin.* have a common reading, *vimokṣa*, differing from the *Skt.*, I believe that the original *Skt.* probably read: *devamanuṣye vimokṣapaṭṭa*°.

"Garment of release" is the name given to a long robe worn by Buddhist priests. Cf. *Ting*, p. 2434 上.

27-29.

Skt. (One of the nos. 27-29 has been lost in the *Skt.*) . . . a bath of sweet-smelling water at *stūpas* of the Tathāgata and to images of the Tathāgata . . . the 32 marks and the 80 subsidiary tokens of a *mahāpuruṣa*.

Tib. Having offered in *stūpas* of the Tathāgata and to images of the Tathāgata grain and fragrant ghee, and having offered a gift of perfumed bathing-water, . . . the 32 marks and the 80 subsidiary tokens of a *mahāpuruṣa*.

Chin. By sprinkling a *stūpa* of the Tathāgata with perfumed water, by bathing the body of a Tathāgata with perfumed water, by smearing and adorning a statue of Buddha with perfumed oil—by all these one obtains the 32 marks and the 80 subsidiary tokens.

27-29. De-bshin-gcegs-paḥi mchod-rten-na, de-bshin-gcegs-paḥi sku-gzugs-la ḥbru mar dri-shim-po phul-la, spos-kyi khrus-chu dbul-ba phul-na rnam-par smin-pa skyes-bu chen-poḥi mtshan sum-cu-rtsa-gñis dañ dpe-byad bzañ-po brgyad-cu . . .

30.

Skt. . . . a *sūtra* . . . everywhere, when he is going to be re-born, and after having been born in a picked family, perpetual beauty.

Tib. . . . bath necessities . . . little sickness in all his rebirths, births in the best of families, and perpetual beauty.

Chin. When all Buddhist monks are bathed by a gift of perfumed water . . . birth in a rich, honorable family, few sicknesses, and tranquility and contentment.

30. *Sūtra* . . . sarvatra jātiṣūtpatsyatā grāhyakuleṣūpapadya samanta-prāsādikavi°.

Khrus-kyi yo-byad . . . tshe-rabs thams-cad-du nad ñuñ-pa dañ rigs-kyi mchog-tu skye-shiñ kun-tu mdses-pa . . .

以香水施浴衆僧。得富貴家生少病安樂。

It seems probable, therefore, that the original Skt. read *snānadānaṃ* for the present *sūtradānaṃ*.

31.

Skt. . . . the five essences . . . everywhere in his rebirths great might.

Tib. . . . five essences . . . great might in all rebirths and the non-curbing of great joys.

Chin. Omitted.

31. *Sñin-po lña* . . . tshe-rabs thams-cad-du mthu che shiñ spro-pa chen-po mi thul-pa . . .

32.

Skt. . . . partaking of the nature of kindness . . . the destruction of malice.

Chin. . . . gift out of kindness . . . friendly and pleasing complexion and mien, and freedom from all anger and hatred.

32. *Byams-pa-la gnas-te* . . . gnod-sems med-pa . . .

33.

Skt. . . . out of compassion . . . great joy.

Tib. . . . out of compassion . . . non-existence of injury.

Chin. . . . out of compassion . . . freedom from killing and injuring.

33. *Sñiñ-rje-la gnas-te* . . . ðtshe-ba med-pa . . .

It seems almost certain that the platitude *mahāsukha* has been substituted for the very definite *ahimsā*.

34.

Skt. . . . out of joy . . . joy and happiness.

Tib. . . . out of joy . . . fearlessness.

Chin. . . . out of joy . . . fearlessness and a far departure from sadness and vexation.

34. Dgaḥ-ba-la gnas-te . . . mi ḥjigs-pa sbyin-pa . . .

35.

Skt. . . . out of equanimity . . . destruction of discontent.

Chin. . . . made with abandonment . . . freedom from impediments and obstacles, and the joy of witnessing *nirvāṇa*.

35. Btañ-sñoms-la gnas-te . . . mi dgaḥ-ba spoñ-ba . . .

36.

Skt. . . . diverse and variegated . . . diverse enjoyments of various and many kinds.

Tib. . . . of every kind . . . all enjoyments.

Chin. . . . of all kinds of things . . . all kinds of happiness.

36. Rnam-pa sna-tshogs-kyi . . . loñs-spyod sna-tshogs . . .

37.

Skt. . . . abandoning all gain . . . the perfect enlightenment without peer.

Tib. . . . without hope of return . . . perfect enlightenment without peer.

Chin. . . . made without cease and that of mutuality . . . the perfect, complete enlightenment without peer.

37. Lan-la mi re-pa-la gnas-te . . . bla-na med-pa yañ-dag-par rdsogs-paḥi byañ-chub . . .

CONCLUSION

Skt. In these 37 ways, O monks, a wise man gives his gift. This the Blessed One said. Transported in mind, the monks praised the Blessed One's speech.

Tib. Monks, by the wise in the 37 ways are gifts given. When the Blessed One had spoken these words, these monks, being delighted, praised what the Blessed One had said.

Chin. Buddha declared to the monks: Thus there are 37 ways. The slight, but excellent gifts which the wise man makes, you today perceive and grasp.

Conc. Dge-sloñ-dag mkhas-pa rnams-kyis rnam-pa sum-cu-rtsa-bdun-po-dag sbyin-pa byin-na. Bcom-ldan-ḥdas-kyis de-skad-ces bkah-stsal-nas, dge-sloñ de-dag-yi rañs-te, bcom-ldan-ḥdas-kyis gsuñs-pa-la mñon-par bstod-do.

The Chin. then continues as follows: And then the king of Śrāvastī said to Buddha: World-honored, we ask how to make gifts. Buddha said: King, if at the time of making a gift one seeks most excellent happiness in return,—out of kindness, without killing, far from all desires, with correct views, with proper appearance, far from the non-virtuous, maintaining the prohibitions, in the presence of virtuous friends, shutting the door to the way of evil, opening the road to birth as a god, benefiting others with one's own profits, with one's heart at peace, etc.—if the gift is thus made, it is a true gift; it is a field of great happiness.

In again making a gift if one follows his own heart's desire, he will obtain the return which is fitting. If with an excellent color, a well-known incense, a delicacy, something soft to the touch, or with his own hand one gives a gift, one obtains in return a family honored by all men, and perfect wealth and honors, and tranquility and contentment.

If one makes a gift of food and drink, one obtains great strength. If one makes a gift of a milk-oil-lamp, one obtains a divine eye. . . . of music, one obtains a divine ear. . . . of liquid medicine, one obtains a long life. . . . of a residence, one obtains a two-storeyed house, a hall, a field, and a garden; . . . of an essay on the Law, one obtains sweet dew (= blessings).

Buddha said: King, if the gift of keeping the ten virtues is made, one obtains again ten kinds of proper returns. The ten virtues are: not to kill a living being, not to steal, not to commit adultery, not to speak falsely, not to speak with pride, not to slander, not to employ a double tongue, not to covet, not to become angry, not to be foolish.² One obtains a life not suffering a pre-

² This list is identical in some items with the ten moral precepts usually quoted in the manuals on Buddhism as obligatory for the monk. A cursory perusal of the manuals seems to show that there are several lists of precepts which agree only in the first three or four injunctions. It is my intention, therefore, to publish, in what I hope will not be a too distant future, a study of this problem.

mature death, riches which are not scattered and lost, a family which is pure, to speak the truth, freedom from all desires, the things which men regard with joy, to be near amiable friends, not to become poor and destitute, an upright complexion and mien, a proper appearance of wisdom. These are one's rewards.

Buddha said: King, if with a quite excellent offering of food and drink one supports the three jewels, one obtains five kinds of profit: an upright and imposing personal appearance, increasing and flourishing strength, a protracted and long life, tranquility and contentment, and the achievement of argumentative ability. Thus, O all people of India,—fathers, mothers, wives, children, men, women, and families,—thus the above gifts, according to the object of one's desires, are not imperfect.

When he had spoken this doctrine, they all rejoiced greatly, and departed paying him honor.

BRIEF NOTES

A Handful of Books from India

Some of the books mentioned below were received by the reviewer a year after they were sent to him (personally), as he was abroad. Books intended for review should be sent to the JOURNAL directly. Dr. Bimala C. Law, whose monographs on Indian Tribes are well known, has published an attractive little volume on *Women in Buddhist Literature* (Bastian, Ceylon, 1927), which gives a systematic and quite complete treatment of the subject, with perhaps almost too many anecdotes that have no particular significance. Mr. Law's English is on the whole impeccable but we doubt whether Buddha, being shocked at a woman's nakedness, said to her "Sister! Recover your shamelessness" (p. 111). Economic studies are well represented among recent books. N. C. Bandyopadhyaya, M. A., has given a *résumé* of the principles of Kautilya in his recent book of that title (*Kautilya*, Cambray and Co., Calcutta, 1927), in which he discusses the guiding principles of this political teacher and his ideas as to the functions and aims of government, while in Part I of the same author's *Development of Hindu Polity and Political Theories* are discussed the same subjects from the earliest time to the growth of the imperialistic movement, including epic data, with utilization of Vedic and later Sanskrit sources and Buddhist literature, to which are added a careful estimate of ideals and a comparison with Western thought (Calcutta, 1927). Two volumes, which appear to be expanded theses for the degree of Ph. D. and Doctor of Science, respectively, cover much the same ground under the titles, *Theory of Government in Ancient India* and *The State in Ancient India*, both by Beni Prasad, now lecturer in the University of Allahabad (Allahabad, 1927 and 1928). Here both the merits and demerits of Indian doctrines are discussed; data are drawn from a wide extent of literature and, though there is little to substantiate the author's claim that he has diverged radically from his predecessors' conclusions and offered fresh interpretations of the various aspects of his subject, the two volumes make a valuable collection of material. There is perhaps some danger of surfeit in the immense amount of repetition (rehashing

is the inelegant term in America) of what is now old material in economics and philosophy. A single thesis thoroughly carried out is really more valuable than the expanded details got from uniting the lucubrations of previous scholars with some mild comment thereon. Such a capable and narrow (and therefore more useful) study is the excellent monograph of S. V. Karandikar, M. A., entitled *Hindu Exogamy*, (Bombay, 1928), which discusses the subject in its details (*gotra* and *pravara* relationships) from the earliest times to the present, concluding with a chapter on exogamy in the light of eugenics. Here we have old material as far as the texts go, but a fresh and collective arrangement of the data leading to real historical results. Early marriage was arranged outside the family, but cognates could be married in the third generation. Later, agnatic generations began to be excluded, but cognates could intermarry in the third and fourth generation. Despite contradictory data in the text, it is probable that Manu meant to prohibit cognates in the third. Gautama allows marriage in the eighth and sixth generation on the father's and mother's side, respectively, Baudhāyana condones intermarriage in the third generation as a Deccan custom only, local custom being authoritative. The general later rule was to avoid marriage connection as far as the seventh generation on the father's and fifth on the mother's side. There are, however, special caste rules which do not keep this restriction. Another such study, not consisting of voluminous collections of old material, though of a different nature, is the *Kātyāyana-Mata-Saṅgraha* by the scholar already mentioned, Dr. Bandyopadhyaya, published by the Calcutta University Press (1927). It is a collection of the legal fragments of Kātyāyana, some 800 verses, which, though not complete, is a very useful piece of work. Another good study, this time in the field of philosophy, is *A History of the Terms Hinayāna and Mahāyāna and the Origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism* (our friends in India favor long titles) by Ryukan Kimura, lecturer in Calcutta University (published by the Calcutta University, 1927). The author regards the term *mahāyāna* as originally used in the sense of *ekayāna* and synonymous with *bodhisattvayāna*, that is, it proclaimed the Mahāsaṅghika doctrine, that *all* men possessed equal personality with Buddha and were capable of *bodhisattva*-hood and as such, as a vehicle for all, it was the all-embracing, great vehicle (as opposed to the *araha*t-hood of

the cultured). A more partisan monograph, as it has present religious value in India, is the thoughtful discussion of *The Philosophy of Vaishnava Religion*, vol. I, by G. N. Mallik, Professor of Sanskrit in the Comilla Victoria College of Lahore and published there in 1927. It points out the defects in other philosophies and the superior excellence of the Vaishnava philosophy (Punjab Oriental Series, No. xiv). Though essentially a missionary tract, this treatise really contains a shrewd critique of the *māyā* doctrine. The texts, though in Sanskrit, are given both in the original and translation, a practice which, if it had been transferred to the Bengali texts in the *History of Bengali Literature*, by K. N. Das (Naogaon, Rajshahi, Bengal, 1926), would have increased the circulation of this unpretentious little manual. Dr. D. C. Sen's volume on the same subject should have been given less stinted acknowledgment by the author, whose work is by no means the first of its kind, though it gives many new details. As in political, so in philosophical writings of the day there is almost a plethora of books. We reviewed lately a projected history of Indian philosophy in sixteen volumes and we are now confronted with the *History of Indian Philosophy*, by S. K. Belvalkar and R. D. Ranade, professors of Sanskrit and philosophy in Poona and Allahabad, respectively (Poona, 1927). This work may be a modification of the first plan. The present volume is the first published, but is vol. ii of the series; it covers the later Vedic and Brāhmaṇa periods, treating of eschatological speculations, ritual, and the transition to the Upanishads, with a discussion and exposition of these later texts, as arranged by the authors in a new chronological order according to their evaluation of the thought as an index of the evolution of the matter. Here, of course, the ground is more or less doubtful and results drawn from this chronology are hazardous, though not improbable. It is in the finer groupings that there is most danger, but the main chronological scheme, with the Brāhmaṇas assigned to 1800-2000 B. C., the Upanishads to 1200-600, and the epic as pre-Buddhistic, will also be challenged by more conservative scholars. The scheme of Upanishads divides them into four separate groups with subdivisions. The Brhad Ār. i. 1-2 is given to Group 1; *ibid.* i. 4 to Group ii in the sub-division ("early") 1; then vi. 1-3 falls into the "middle" division of the same Group and vi. 2 into Group iii in the "early" division, with ii. 1 and 4, iii, and iv. 3-4 assigned to

the "middle" division of the same Group, etc., interesting but not always convincing indications of development. The authors agree that the Rig Veda is not "pure priest-poetry through and through," unless this theory be taken *cum grano salis*, and they set the end of the collection where the reviewer sets the beginning, c. 1200 B. C.; but many will agree with them in this, if not in regarding the epic as pre-Buddhistic.

Two minor works may complete this summary. *The Outline of Ancient Indian History and Civilisation*, by Dr. R. C. Majumdar, M. A., Ph. D. (1927, published by the author), is an unpretentious but handy book for the use of those who desire an accurate general knowledge of this subject. The author thinks his work may be usefully applied to correct the deficiencies and inaccuracies of others, since Smith's history is merely political and R. C. Dutt's *Ancient India* is not only out of date but also "absolutely unreliable" as regards politics. *Ancient India as described by Ptolemy* (and long ago translated by McCrindle) is republished in a facsimile reprint, with introduction, notes, and a new map, by S. N. Majumdar Śāstrī, as a companion volume to Cunningham's *Geography of India* and McCrindle's *Megasthenes* (Chuckervertty, Chatterjee and Co., Calcutta, 1927). The original version is bettered. McCrindle's identification of Ophir with Supara is now rejected in favor of Ābhīra, or, more probably, Ophir is to be found not in India at all but on the Arabian coast of the Red Sea. Classical scholars may note that "Byzanteion" on the coast of India is not an indication of a Greek settlement, but a Greek rendering of Vizadrog in its earlier form Vijayadurga ("fort of victory"), and Khersonesos means merely the "peninsula" at Kārwār in S. India. Some uncertainty seems to exist in the editor's mind as to the Magoi (Brahmans), interpreted as "sons of Brahmans" on p. 51, on p. 349 as "Zoroastrian priests," (i. e. Magi), and on p. 381 as "priests of the Śākas." An interesting suggestion (not entirely new) on p. 383 is that, as English slave is from Slav, so the Chōlas become *choras* (thieves) and the Cheras (Keralas) become *cheṭas* (servants), as was perhaps the case with Śūdras and *dāsas* in older times. Greek parallels are well known.

E. WASHBURN HOPKINS.

Yale University.

On the Possible Oriental Origin of our Word Booze

There is an old Persian-Turkish word *bōza* or *būza* denoting an alcoholic beverage made from millet, barley, or rice, also translated "beer," which is widely distributed over Asia, Europe, and North Africa. Whether in its origin it is Persian or Turkish I am not sure. Johnson-Richardson-Steingass, in their *Persian-English Dictionary*, list it as Persian, but Vambéry regards it as a very ancient Turkish word, since it occurs in the Uigur Kudatku Bilik of the eleventh century, and he may be right. According to Radloff's *Wörterbuch der Türk-Dialecte* it occurs in Kazan, Jagatai, and Tobol ("beverage from millet or barley"); and Shaw has registered it in his *Vocabulary of the Turkī Language* as *boza*, "a weak intoxicating liquor made from various grains (at Khokand)." The Mongols have adopted it as a loan-word either from Persian or Turkish in the form *bodzo*, and Kowalewski, in his *Mongol Dictionary*, defines it as "an alcoholic beverage made from barley-meal or milk." The word is well known to the Osmons and is recorded as early as 1674 in the *Epistola de moribus ac institutis Turcarum*, written by Th. Smith of the College Maria Magdalena of Oxford. Speaking of the beverages of the Turks, he goes on to say, "They also have other liquors rather peculiar to them of which I shall only mention Bozza made from millet," etc. Lane (*Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*) mentions *boozeh* or *boozah* as an intoxicating liquor commonly drunk by the boatmen of the Nile and by other persons of the lower orders.

What this kind of booze was is well described by J. L. Burckhardt in his *Travels in Nubia* (London, 1822), p. 201: "Few traders pass through Berber without taking a mistress, if it be only for a fortnight. Drunkenness is the constant companion of this debauchery, and it would seem as if the men in these countries had no other objects in life. The intoxicating liquor which they drink is called *buza*. Strongly leavened bread made from Dhurra [Sorghum] is broken into crumbs, and mixed with water, and the mixture is kept for several hours over a slow fire. Being then removed, water is poured over it, and it is left for two nights to ferment. This liquor, according to its greater or smaller degree of fermentation, takes the names of merin, buza, or om belbel, the

mother of nightingales, so called because it makes the drunkard sing. At the beginning of the sitting, some roasted meat, strongly peppered, is generally circulated, but the buza itself (they say) is sufficiently nourishing, and indeed the common sort looks more like soup or porridge than a liquor to be taken at a draught." In another passage he writes, "During the fortnight I remained at Berber I heard of half a dozen quarrels occurring in drinking parties, all of which finished in knife or sword wounds. Nobody goes to a Buza but without taking his sword with him, and the girls are often the first sufferers in the affray." It is evident that in the latter case *buza* has the meaning "drinking-bout."

M. Holderness (*Notes relating to the Manners and Customs of the Crim Tatars*, London, 1821, p. 59), writes, "Another, and I believe the only strong liquor which they are allowed is called booza; it is made either from rice or millet, and with this, it is said, they occasionally get much intoxicated."

From Osmanli our word has migrated into all Slavic languages, also into Rumanian, Hungarian, Albanian, and Neo-Greek. The Turkish origin of the Slavic series was first recognized by F. Miklosich, the eminent Slavic philologist, and has been confirmed by Berneker in his *Slavisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Russian *buza* denotes "a beverage made from wheat-flour or oat-meal soaked in water," or according to Pawlowski "a beverage made from buck-wheat flour or oatmeal, also cider." In Serbo-Croatian *buza* applies to a drink made from maize flour or the sap of a birch. Czech and Polish have *buza*, Bulgarian *boza*. In Rumanian *boza*, *bouza*, or *bozan* signifies "a drink made from millet"; and *bozán*, "a kind of beer." These words are classified among the Turkish loans in Rumanian by A. de Cihac, *Dictionnaire d'étymologie dacoromane*, p. 551. In Albanian we meet *bózë* as "a beverage made from pea-flour" and *bozadží*, "one engaged in making boza, a booze-maker." In Magyar also, *boza* has been recognized as a Turkish loan-word. The Neo-Greek form is *μύζας* or *μρουζάς*, which likewise denotes a millet beer.

Finally the French have adopted this word from Turkish as *bouza* or *bosan* ("Turkish millet beer"), and *buza* is also found in Spanish and Portuguese.

The *Oxford English Dictionary* has also registered the word *buza* in five different spellings (*booza*, *boza*, *bosa*, *bonza*, *boosa*) as

derived from Turkish *boza* with the definition given by Redhouse "a kind of thick white drink made of millet fermented" and with a quotation from Blount's *Glossogr.* (1656): "Boza, a drink in Turkey made of seed, much like new mustard, and is very heady."

In view of this situation and the wide distribution of the Turkish word over Europe it occurred to me whether our word *booze* might not be connected with this series. As is well known, many of our culture words have been claimed as European which at closer range have turned out to be of Oriental origin. In English, it seems to me, we must distinguish between the verb *to booze* and the noun *booze* in the sense of strong drink. The verb *to booze* is properly *to bouse*, which is connected by our English lexicographers with German *bausen*, Middle Low German *busen*, akin to *bauschen* ("to bulge, swell up, to revel") and *baus* ("abundance"). This verb, of course, is Germanic, though not traceable to an earlier date than the thirteenth century; but as to the noun *booze* a contamination at least with the Turkish word seems possible.

Whatever the relation of *buza* to *booze* may be, the coincidence itself is suggestive: there is *booze* East and West. There is also the notable semasiological coincidence that both the Oriental *buza* and English *booze* have assumed the double significance: a drink and a drinking bout. The *Oxford Dictionary* defines *booze*, *boose* 1. a drink, a draught; 2. drinking, a drinking bout.

BERTHOLD LAUFER.

Field Museum, Chicago.

The Feminine Singulars of the Egyptian Demonstrative Pronouns

The following are the forms¹ of one of the Egyptian pronouns meaning *this*:

- m. s.—*pn*
- f. s.—*tn*
- m. p.—*y²pn*
- f. p.—*y²ptn*

¹ All the forms of the Egyptian pronoun used in this article are taken from section 57, page 29 of *Ägyptische Grammatik* von Günther Roeder, zweite Auflage, 1926.

² *y* is here used where Roeder uses *j*.

Disregarding the feminine singular, one may rightly observe that the basic element is *pn*, that the plural is formed by prefixing *y* and that the feminine is characterized by the infixing of *t* after the *p*. The last of these observations is clearly illustrated in the feminine plural but is by no means obvious in the feminine singular. Gardiner, Erman, Roeder and as many other authorities as I have seen neither point out the problem nor call attention to the scheme which the demonstratives follow.

What happened to the *p* (of the basic pronominal element) in the feminine singular? Why do we have *tn* instead of **ptn*? Why does not the feminine singular follow the regular scheme as does the feminine plural?

The form **ptn* with neither a vowel in the initial position nor one immediately following the first consonant could very easily become *tn*. Such a development may be paralleled by examples from other languages.³ Enough illustrations of this sort of change are available to show that *pt* under proper conditions may change to *tt* or simply *t*. Thus *tn* is from **ptn*. This explanation throws light on the feminine singulars of the other demonstrative pronouns:

	<i>this</i>	<i>that</i>	<i>the</i>
m. s.	<i>pw</i>	<i>pf'</i> [*]	<i>p'</i>
f. s.	<i>tw</i>	<i>tf'</i>	<i>t'</i>

Thus *tw* is from **ptw*, *tf'* from **ptf'* and *t'* from **pt'*.

On the basis of the above, several corollaries may, with much

³ Due to difficulty in reproducing an exotic phonetic combination, Greek loan words in English beginning with *pt* are pronounced as if they began with just *t*; e. g.; *ptomaine*, *pteron*, *Ptolemy* etc. A similar assimilation of initial *p* takes place in the pronunciation of initial *ψ* of Greek words taken over into English; to wit, *psychology*, *pseudepigraphy*, *psalm* etc. In all these cases learned spellings are kept up against the actual living pronunciation. The Egyptians were not so philologically solicitous as we are.

Italian affords similar assimilations under natural conditions. A Latin combination of *pt* (with no vowel between, although vowels may precede or follow) comes down as *tt* in Italian; thus L. *raptim* or *raptum* → It. *ratto*, L. *aptum* → It. *atto* etc.

^{*} ' is the sign for Hebrew *h* or Arabic hamza which Roeder writes *ʔ*.

likelihood, be deduced in regard to the vocalization of Egyptian. Apparently, *pn*⁵ had no initial vowel, for had it one, as the plural has, the *p* would not have disappeared from the feminine singular. Obviously, *tn* can have no initial vowel. By analogy of **ptn* (which could not have had a vowel between the *p* and *t*) we may conclude that *yptn* had no vowel between the *p* and *t*. In fine, that Egyptian suffered no assimilation of a stop (like *p*) to another if a vowel preceded the first of those stops follows from the survival of the *p* in *yptn*.^{6 7}

CYRUS H. GORDON.

University of Pennsylvania.

Dravidian **geli* and Aryan **gili*

From the words meaning 'rat' or 'mouse' or both, Brāhui *hal*, Gōndi *alli* (pl. *alk*), Kuvi *orli*, Kanara *ili*, Tamil *eli*, Telugu *elike* and *eluka*, we might infer a general Dravidian basis like Tamil *eli*. Brāhui adds and drops *h* freely, and regularly has *a* for ancient short *e*. A displacement of stress accounts for the Gōndi form. Kuvi *orli* corresponds to Tamil *ōr eli* (one rat). Kanara has *i* for *e* before *i* in *ili*, as in *kivi* = Telugu *cevi* (ear).

The sound *j* (consonant-*i*) does not seem to occur as an ancient radical element in Dravidian. Where the history of medial *j* is known, it represents an earlier occlusive or is simply a hiatus-filler. Initial *j*, found before palatal vowels and *ā* (<*e*), appears to be a hiatus-filler which has accidentally become radical in some of the Dravidian languages. But it is possible that initial *j* was sometimes a true radical. Latin *g* has left no trace in Spanish *leer* < *legere*. Likewise Dravidian *eli* may have come from **geli* thru *jeli*, the form which replaces *eli* after a palatal vowel in Tamil.

Dravidian **geli* or a variant **gili*, or perhaps **geli* with the undefined sound that became *i* in Sanskrit, could be the source of

⁵ As also *pw*, *pf* and *p'*. Observe Coptic ΠΑῖ and its feminine ΤΑῖ which substantiates this hypothesis.

⁶ As also in *yptw*.

⁷ In contrast to the Italian development from the Latin mentioned in note 3.

Aryan **gīli* = Sanskrit *giri* (mouse). If the Aryan word came from Dravidian and is connected with Latin *glis*, the borrowing must have been extremely ancient. The form **geli* is remarkably like Austric equivalents given by Kuhn in his *Beiträge zur Sprachenkunde Hinterindiens*, in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Bavarian Academy for 1889: *gnī*, *khnāi*, *kanei*. A basic **ghni* or **ghani* might be either a derivative or the source of a Dravidian **ghali*. A distinctive aspiration of native occlusives is now generally lacking in southern Dravidian, but it seems to have formerly been a normal element of the sound-system.

EDWIN H. TUTTLE.

North Haven, Conn.

A passage in the Uttara-Rāma-Carita of Bhavabhūti

The passage referred to is I, 15, 5 where Sītā describes the appearance of Rāma, translated by Belvalkar H. O. S., Vol. 21, p. 20, as follows "the (waving) tufts of hair gracefully adorning (his face)—thus is my noble Lord painted here." I suggest that (waving) should be omitted and to read (him) for (his face). I do not think that waving locks *on* the face can be supported by any literary or monumental parallel; and cf. *ib.* IV, 19 "the round tufted locks (of a Kṣatriya)." Such round tufted locks on the head are represented in many Ajaṇṭā paintings, e. g. *Portfolio of Indian Art*, Boston, 1923, Pl. XV. The meaning "tufts of hair on the head" is supported by the commentator Premacandra-tarkavāgopā who explains *śikhaṇḍa* as *cūḍā* (I am indebted for this reference to Professor Lanman). On the other hand, if "adorning his face be retained," the reference must be to long locks (not "tufts") falling from the head and framing the face; and examples justifying this are common enough in the Gupta period (e. g. *H. I. I. A.* fig. 179, prince on extreme left, and prince seated and many sculptures showing long locks falling to the shoulders).

A. K. COOMARASWAMY.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Die buddhistische Spätantike in Mittelasien. Von A. von LeCoq und E. WALDSCHMIDT. Sechster Teil: Neue Bildwerke II. Mit einem Beitrag über die Darstellungen und den Stil der Wandgemälde aus Qyzil bei Kutscha. Berlin: DIETRICH REIMER (ERNST VOHSEN), 1928. 90 pages folio, with 33 full-page plates (of which twelve in colors) and 233 illustrations in text.

This volume is produced in the same magnificent style as the previous publications of the series. The wall-paintings here published for the first time were brought back by Professor von LeCoq from the neighborhood of Kuča, in Turkestan, and have just been unpacked and set up in the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde. They are dated by their discoverer in the 7th and 8th centuries. Most of them are of the "older" style, directly derived from Gandhāra and thru that showing clear traces of classical art, as modified by Indian and Iranian influences. There are, however, some pictures of the Chinese school of the T'ang period, which was derived from that older school. These pictures are specially interesting and important, as LeCoq indicates in his Vorwort, because "they show great charm and that artistic perfection which has long been conjectured of the products of this most important period of Chinese painting;" but only conjectured, because assuredly genuine paintings of the period, on such an extensive scale, can hardly be said to have been known before.

The intrinsic beauty of many of the paintings shows up especially well in the colored reproductions, which are all that could be desired from the artistic viewpoint. The marvelous coloring of these pictures from Turkestan has always been one of their chief attractions, and those here presented in color are worthy examples of the type. Some of them combine with this elements of story-interest. Notable among these is the large picture in Plate 13, fortunately in very good condition, except that unhappily the Buddha's head is missing. It represents the Buddha with attendants standing by a river, on the opposite bank of which kneels a prince or noble, with his followers, in attitudes of adoration. The Buddha's attitude, seemingly on tip-toes, suggests that the painter meant to represent him as

flying thru the air. Dr. Waldschmidt has plausibly identified the scene as the Buddha's miraculous crossing of the Ganges in the presence of Varṣakāra, the brahman minister of King Ajātaśatru. The story is quoted by him from the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin school, and it seems at least likely that this is the incident which the artist had in mind. There are a number of similar stories in other Buddhist sources; most of them are collected by W. Norman Brown in his recent book, *The Indian and Christian Miracles of Walking on the Water* (Chicago, 1928), but this version is not referred to there (see p. 19 for the closest parallels).

The major part of the text is taken up with Dr. Waldschmidt's very valuable essay "Ueber die Darstellungen und den Stil der Wandgemälde aus Qyzil bei Kutscha." Its first division describes, with pictorial reproductions, twenty-six Avadāna and Jātaka scenes taken from wall-friezes, now published for the first time, with parallels, chiefly from other local finds, but occasionally also from Indian and Farther-Indian localities, such as Ajanta, Sanchi, and Borobudur. To these are added in the third section some other similar scenes from vaulted roofs of cave-temples in the same locality. Between these two parts is placed the equally important second section, which analyzes the style of these paintings, distinguishing the Hellenistic, Indian, and native (Iranian) elements. Interesting is Waldschmidt's opinion that thru the latter we find traces of the oldest Mesopotamian art still visible in these late Turkestan pieces. He would find this notably (p. 26) in the arrangement of series of dedicators or worshippers ("Stifter"), which recall to his mind ancient Persian and Assyro-Babylonian art by their rigid, symmetrical, and individually undifferentiated rows of human figures.

Interesting to all students of Buddhism will be the story-scenes described and reproduced in the first and third parts of this essay. Over 80 different stories are treated, with over 200 pictures; and of these Waldschmidt believes that he has identified with certainty over 60 stories with 160-170 illustrations. While many of the illustrations have, of course, been published before, the new material is large enough to make a very important addition to our stock of pictorial representations of Buddhist legends. Waldschmidt's identifications are intelligent and careful, and most of them are

likely to be right, tho in some cases the scant evidence of the often very slight and conventionalized pictures leaves perhaps more room for doubt. The literary references furnisht are limited mostly to the primary sources, but these are sufficient to make it possible for scholars to follow further any subject which interests them. Many of them are, as was to be expected, very familiar; some of the favorite stories of the Buddhists are found. There is the celebrated Mahākapi Jātaka (No. 407), in several effective representations. There are the two forms of the Śibi Jātaka, the one (Jātaka 499) in which the king sacrifices his eyes (on this wide-spread motif see Burlingame, *Buddhist Parables*, New Haven, 1922, pp. 424 ff.), and the other story, at least equally famous in India, in which the king weighs his own flesh against that of a pursued and suppliant bird. Other famous stories are the Śaḍdanta Jātaka, the Śaśa Jātaka, the Nyagrodhamṛga Jātaka, the story of King Haricandra, etc.

La valeur du parfait dans les hymnes védiques. Par LOUIS RENOU.
 [Collection linguistique, publiée par la Société de Linguistique de Paris. XVIII.] Paris: ÉDOUARD CHAMPION, 1925.
 ix + 218 pp.

This is a careful, thoro, grammatical study of the kind which was more fashionable forty years ago than it is now—more's the pity. The title is too modest. In studying the Vedic perfect the author found it necessary to take up many other problems of Vedic grammar, such as the use of the aorist and imperfect, and of nominal phrases which may replace finite verb forms, the distinction between active and middle voices, and others. In every case he throws a flood of light on Vedic usage. And he presents his materials thruout in such detail, with such careful marshalling of the evidence of numerous individual passages, that his book will stand for a long time as an indispensable reference-book for Vedic exegesis.

If his general results cannot easily be presented in brief summary, this lies in the nature of the case. He has creditably resisted the temptation to generalize more than the facts warrant. He finds the "Indo-European" force of the perfect, denoting a

state regarded as more or less permanently fixt, or a result more or less permanently achieved, still extensively present in the Rigveda. This is especially the case where the verb has no well-developed present-system; and it manifests itself often in standard, set formulas. Altho the perfect develops into a preterite tense in the RV. itself, this preterite tends to retain clear traces of the prehistoric meaning, and is thus distinguisht, at least to a large extent, from the imperfect, the common tense of simple past narration, and still more from the aorist, which originally was the form of simple assertion (*constatation*) without regard to time, and which as a preterite came early to be associated with events falling within the direct knowledge of the speaker. There is a marked tendency to avoid the perfect in these last-named cases; hence the first person singular perfect is a rare form in all periods of the language, particularly with preterite meaning.

There are clear differences in use between the perfects active and middle; but to a large extent they do not correspond to the distinction between presents active and middle. This subject leads to a penetrating study of the general use of the two voices. It is shown that, particularly in forms with secondary endings and in the participles, Indo-Iranian usage did not sharply distinguish in meaning between active and middle. Thus a middle form in *-ta* or a participle in *-āna* is often associated with an otherwise active inflection, without difference in meaning. "The differentiation of the voices in the participle, contrary to Brugmann's opinion, . . . is a secondary phenomenon, which was not yet fully realized in the time of the RV." (p. 136.) Hence we are not surprised to learn that the use of the voices in the perfect is often quite different from that in other parts of the verb, particularly the present. Especially, we often find a perfect active going with a present middle, in cases where either no present active occurs, or it has a different shade of meaning. When the perfect middle is used, it tends to remain closer than the active to the prehistoric, non-preterite value of the perfect. This is partly explained by the fact that the perfect middle endings are practically identical with those of the present. "The purely preterite value is only rarely attacht to the perfect middle in the RV., if we except the mystic and brahmanic hymns" (p. 180).

In general, the author concludes, the use of the past tenses in

the RV. is, in spite of the exigencies of meter, more logical and coherent than is often supposed. It is a mistake to believe, as has been held by some distinguished scholars, that the Brāhmaṇa prose, for instance, furnishes a closer approximation to prehistoric usage than Rigvedic poetry.

Tattvasaṅgraha of Śāntarakṣita, with the Commentary of Kamalaśīla. Edited with an Introduction in Sanskrit by EMBAR KRISHNAMACHARYA . . . with a Foreword by the General Editor. [Gaekwad's Oriental Series, XXX-XXXI.] Baroda, 1926. 2 vols.: clviii + 80 + 936 + 6 + 4 + 102 pp.

The Buddhistic philosophical text here edited for the first time is the work of an author of whom little has been known hitherto. Known chiefly from Tibetan sources, under several names (Śānta- or Śānti-rakṣita, Ācārya Bodhisattva), he is said to have been abbot of Nalanda and to have visited Tibet in the first half of the eighth century. His pupil Kamalaśīla, author of the commentary (*Pañjikā*) here printed, is also reported to have visited Tibet about the same time.

The text is based on a single manuscript,¹ from a Jain library in Pattan. It is an old ms. (dated samvat 1492), and in poor condition. Other mss. were known to exist, but their Jain custodians are reported to have refused access to them. The editor seems to have done as well as could reasonably be expected with such faulty material; but the result is necessarily very tentative in not a few places.

This is a pity; for there is no doubt of the importance of the work for the history of Indian philosophy. It is a distinctly polemic treatise. In twenty-six chapters it sets forth the position of the Vijñānavādin school of Buddhism on as many points of dogma; but always in the form of replies to opponents, whose views are first stated as *pūrvapakṣa*. These opponents include all the well-known schools: Cārvākas, Jains, Sāṃkhyas, Yogins, Naiyāyikas, Vaiśeṣikas, grammarians, Advaitins, and various rival schools of Buddhism. But the favorite opponent is the Pūrva-Mīmāṃsaka,

¹ So the editor distinctly states in his Sanskrit introduction, p. 68. The English Foreword, p. ix, speaks misleadingly of "manuscripts."

represented chiefly by the great Kumārila. "It seems probable that the *Tattvasaṃgraha* was written mainly to refute the arguments and theories of Kumārila and Uddyotakara, the two deadliest antagonists of Buddhism in those days" (Foreword, p. lxxxii f.). However, Uddyotakara is certainly far less prominent than Kumārila. According to the editor's list of quoted passages, he was the only writer who was paid the compliment of extensive quotation. Over 400 quotations from his *Śloka Vārtika*² are identified; a large proportion, considering that the whole *Tattvasaṃgraha* contains but 3646 *ślokas*. Yet it is not large enuf to express the full truth as to the author's use of Kumārila. The editor himself points out (Sanskrit introduction, p. 68) that Kumārila is evidently understood to be the author of many unidentified verses, e. g. in the long passage dealing with the *sarvajña*, pp. 817-844 (*pūrvapakṣa*). I may add that some of these verses (*ślokas* 3187-3190, 3215, 3217) are attributed to Kumārila in the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*, where, curiously, they are quoted as directed against the Jains rather than the Buddhists. (As they deal with the alleged omniscience of sect-founders, denied by Kumārila, they apply equally well to both).

The general editor of the Series, Dr. Benoytosh Bhattacharyya, in an elaborate and useful Foreword, gives an English summary of the whole work, and discusses the personalities and dates of the authors quoted in the text and commentary.

SYĀDVĀDAMAÑJARI. . . . *Hemacandrācāryaviracitā Anyayogavyavachedikā, tadvyākhyā ca śrī-Malliṣeṇasūripranīta Syādvādamāñjari*. . . . OSWĀL-vaṇigvaṇśajaśreṣṭhi- LĀDHĀJI-tanūja-MOTILĀL-ity etaiḥ . . . *saṃśodhitā*. Poona: Arhatamata Prabhakar, Vīrasamvat 2452 [= 1926]. 68 + 244 + 6 pp.

The famous Jain scholar Hemacandra (12th century) composed two brief expositions of Jain doctrine, each consisting of only thirty-two verses, under the guise of hymns of praise (*stotra*, or *stuti*) to the founder of Jainism, Mahāvīra. Both were first printed in the *Kāvyamālā*, Part VII, p. 102 ff. (Bombay, 1890), under the title

² None from his other works. Most of Kumārila's polemics are, of course, found in the *ŚV*, so it is not surprising that this should have chiefly engaged the attention of philosophical opponents. Yet one wonders whether the *Tantra Vārtika*, for instance, can have been totally ignored?

Śrīmahāvīrasvāmīstotram. One is called Ayogavyavachedikā and deals chiefly with a positive or direct account of Jainism; the other is called Anyayogavyavachedikā and is chiefly polemic, dealing with the views of opposing systems. A commentary on the latter, called Syādvādamañjarī, was composed by Malliṣeṇa Sūri in the thirteenth century (completed in 1292, according to the text itself). It was first printed in 1900 as Volume 9 of the Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series at Benares. This edition (on which see Barth, *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, vol. 45, 1902, p. 173 f.) is very imperfect. The incomprehensibilities of which Barth complains are in large part due to incompetent editing. This new edition is therefore welcome. It is competently done on the basis of a number of mss., and is provided with a useful introduction and notes, in which an effort has been made to trace to the original sources the opposing views against which the text polemizes. These are mostly Vaiśeṣika and Nyāya authorities, tho the Mīmāṃsakas, Vedāntins, Buddhists, Cārvākas, Sāṃkhyas, and Yogins also receive attention.

According to Winternitz, 2, p. 342, Hemacandra composed also a Vītarāgastotra, "which in the form of a glorification of the Jina contains a short account of the Jain religion," which W. distinguishes from the "Mahāvīrasvāmīstotra" above mentioned, and which he says was printed with two commentaries at Bombay in 1911. The Chowkhamba edition of the Syādvādamañjarī, on its titlepage, calls it a commentary on Hemacandra's Vītarāgastuti—a title which does not seem to be found in the text, which calls it only Anyayogavyavachedikā. Unfortunately I have no access to the Bombay edition of 1911; but I conjecture that the name Vītarāgastotra (or °stuti) is only another synonym for Mahāvīrasvāmīstotra, which as we saw includes both the Anyayogavyavachedikā and its companion-piece, the Ayogavyavachedikā. I do not know what to make of the "two commentaries," unless one of them belongs to the Ayogavyavachedikā. The editor of the Poona edition here reviewed makes the very positive statement (Introduction, p. 1) that Malliṣeṇa's Syādvādamañjarī is the only commentary ever composed, before or since, on the Anyayogavyavachedikā. Malliṣeṇa himself says (p. 2) that he considered it unnecessary to write a commentary on the Ayogavyavachedikā because it was easy to understand (*sukhonneyatvāt*).

FRANKLIN EDGERTON.

Yale University.

Samaṅgasūtradhāra. By King BHOJADEVA. Edited by Mahāmahopādhyāya T. GAṆAPATI ŚĀSTRĪ. Volume II. (Gaekwar's Oriental Series, No. XXXII). Baroda: CENTRAL LIBRARY, 1925.

It may be noted here that Bhojadeva's *Yuktikalpataru*, a treatise on ship-building and other matters, has been edited by Paṇḍit Īśvara Candra Śāstrī, Calcutta, 1917. The present volume contains chapters 55-83 of the whole work; the various chapters describe the construction and measurements of temples, methods of painting and plastering, the proportions proper for different kinds of images, the *rasas* as represented in painting and sculpture, and the various *hastas* used in dramatic dancing (the author apparently therefore sharing the view of the *Viṣṇudharmottaram* that a knowledge of the technique of dancing is necessary to a proper understanding of painting). It is high time that the numerous *Silpa-sāstras* now available as edited texts should be translated and compared; in this field there is also a great deal to be done by the lexicographer.

Principles of Indian Silpaśāstra; with the text of Mayaśāstra.

By P. N. BOSE. Lahore: PUNJAB SANSKRIT BOOK DEPOT, 1926.

Unfortunately this volume does not fulfil the functions suggested by the title. It ignores a great deal that has been published on the subject (e. g. by Ram Raz some hundred years ago, by the late T. A. G. Rao, by Acharya, and by myself, to mention only material in English). A very superficial knowledge of the history of Indian art is shown; thus we are told that, "The only instance we have of the figure of a king in India is perhaps the broken Mathura statue of the Maharaja Kaniska."

Professor Bose seems to think that the *Silpaśāstras* were invented at a late date to compensate for the effects of a decadence in art. This in the first place ignores the fact that there were certainly existing such works in the Gupta period: Hsüan Tsang clearly refers to their existence, or if Professor Bose had looked at Gupta art he would have realized that it certainly depended already upon

a canon as well as upon tradition. Nor is there the slightest evidence that Indian artists or any of their patrons have ever been conscious of a decadence, hence we cannot suppose that such a consciousness led to the formation of rules. These have their beginnings in the earliest descriptions of the gods, and in the "science" of physiognomy. Such ancient descriptions as those of Mahāvīra in the *Aupapātika Sūtra*, or of the Buddha as a Cakravartin, have all the character of canonical prescriptions. The volume, nevertheless, should not be ignored by the special student of the subject.

Pallava Architecture. By A. H. LONGHURST. Parts I and II (*Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India*, Nos. 17 and 33), 1924 and 1928.

Two Statues of Pallava Kings and Five Pallava Inscriptions in a Rock Temple at Mamallapuram. By H. K. SASTRI. (*Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India*, No. 26), 1926.

These monographs are exceedingly welcome, and all scholars will look forward to Mr. Longhurst's subsequent volumes. Pallava architecture is of the greatest importance in the history of Indian art, not only because of its aesthetic value, but because (a) it represents the natural prolongation and development of the Eastern Āndhra style in Veṅgī, and (b) the monuments are the oldest extant in permanent materials south of Veṅgī. We know indeed from the important inscription of Mahendravarman I (600-625) at Maṇḍagapattu that structural temples had previously been built of brick, timber, copper, and mortar. The first excavated shrines (Undavalli, etc.) are due to this king.

The Māmalla style (625-674) covers the well-known 'Seven Pagodas' and 'Descent of the Ganges' at Māmallapuram (Māvalivaram, Mahābalipuram, 40 miles south of Madras). Mr. Longhurst accepts the identification of the great rock cut sculpture as representing the descent of the Ganges: but it is extraordinary that he does not recognize the ascetic figure as Bhagīratha, and omits to refer to the earliest correct interpretation of the theme, published by Goloubew in 1921 (*Ars Asiatica* III—where the finest and most detailed reproduction of the sculptures will be found). In connection with the unfinished treatment of the same subject at No. 20 (p. 44 and pl. XXXIII, a), reference might well

have been made to the similarly treated cleft rock at the Isurumuniya Vihāra in Ceylon, where Pallava influence is unmistakably evident.

Mr. Sastri identifies two very fine reliefs, in the Ādivarāha-Perumāl shrine, dating probably from the latter part of the seventh century (not yet dealt with by Mr. Longhurst) as royal groups representing Mahendravarman I and his son Narasimhavarman—Siṃhaviṣṇu. Another inscription in the same shrine contains what is probably the earliest list of avatārs of Viṣṇu including the name of Buddha.

Manimekhalai in its historical setting. By S. KRISHNASWAMI
AIYANGAR. London: LUZAC & Co., n. d. (1928). xxxv +
235 pp.

In this useful study the author provides a translation, literal so far as Books XXVII, XXIX, and XXX are concerned, and slightly abridged elsewhere. This abridgement is to be regretted, as the text contains much matter of great interest to the general student of Indian culture. The three Books completely translated deal with "the Heretical Systems," "Buddhist Logic," and the "Teachings of Buddhism." From a somewhat elaborate study of these parts, and a comparison with what is known of the historical development of these systems from other sources, and from literary and other considerations, the author concludes that the *Manimekhalai*, closely connected with the *Silappadhikāram*, is essentially a Sangam work, certainly pre-Pallava, and probably to be dated in the third century A. D. The story itself is well-known, though the author does not seem to have been acquainted with Vinson's French version in *Légendes bouddhistes et djainas*, Paris, 1900. Apart from the philosophical material, attention may be called to the fact that the dominant theme of the story constitutes one of the most remarkable of the many Grail parallels traceable in Indian literature and mythology. How striking this parallel is will be apparent to all Grail students from the following passage, in which the event is foretold: "There will appear a damsel with a begging bowl (once the Buddha's) in her hand. Fed from that inexhaustible bowl the whole living world will revive. As a result of her grace, rains will

pour in plenty at the command of Indra, and many other miracles will take place in this town. Even when rains fail, the country will still have abundance of water." The bowl further provides an inexhaustible supply of food. There exists, in fact, a very extensive old Indian (and older Mesopotamian) mythology of the Water of Life; and just as Christianity moulded analogous material in Europe into the later forms of the Grail legend, so Buddhism in India in highly characteristic fashion adapted an earlier Pagan tradition to its own edifying purposes: cf. *Lalita Vistara*, VII, 91 "with the Water of Life (*amṛta*) shalt thou heal the suffering due to the corruption of our mortal nature." Indianists who are interested in such problems will find an introduction to the subject in Weston, J. L., *From ritual to romance*, Cambridge (Eng.), 1920. It may be remarked here that some of the most remarkable material is to be found in the story of Śiva in the Devadāruvana; I hope to gather together some of this and other material on another occasion. Quite apart from these matters, to which Professor Aiyangar makes no allusion, the volume is of the highest value as a contribution to literary and Buddhist sectarian history. Its contents were originally given in the form of lectures at the University of Madras.

Masterpieces of Rajput painting, by O. C. GANGOLY. Calcutta: Rūpam Office, n. d. (1927). 116 pp., 28 color plates, 24 photogravures.

A very sumptuous publication "undertaken with the object of attracting the judgment of critics and connoisseurs and of winning popularity for a phase of painting which has so much originality, popularity, depth, and, sometimes, charm and fascination." In the milieu in which these paintings originate, as the author remarks, "princes and peasants are happily linked together with a unity of thought and identity of culture"; the paintings are "indissolubly related to Hindi religious poetry." The descriptions of the plates are accompanied by texts and translations taken from inscriptions on the originals, or from analogous Hindi sources; these translations are carefully made, and while opinions may differ as to the rendering of particular passages, add much to the interpretative value of the whole work. The color plates and photogravures are excellent,

and if a few of the originals are hardly masterpieces, all add to our knowledge of the school. The author and publishers are to be congratulated on the production of a work which is at once scholarly and elegant. I acknowledge gratefully the dedication.

Costumes et parures khmèrs d'après les Devatā d'Angkor Vat.
Par SAPPHO MARCHAL. Paris and Brussels: VAN OEST,
1927. Pp. xi + 114, with 41 Plates.

An admirable work. Forty-one crowded Plates of outline drawings of the elaborate and exquisite crowns and jewels worn by the Devatās sculptured on the walls of Angkor Wāt in the twelfth century. The designation Devatā is well chosen, and preferable to Apsarās: for we do not know that these are really figures of dancers, divine or human, and they seem rather to be distant relatives of the Devatās and Yakṣīs of the Bharhut and Mathurā railings.

One wishes that work of this kind could be done in India; a detailed study of costume and ornament at Amarāvati, for example, or in Kuṣāna art, would be invaluable. The authoress justly remarks that in Cambodia, as in India, belief and ornament are alike closely connected with the vegetable world: not only the decoration of the crowns, but the motifs of the jewellery are all floral, the lotus and coconut flowers providing the main sources.

Dances cambodgiennes. Par SAPPHO MARCHAL. Saigon, 1926.
Pp. 57, with photographic and outline illustrations.

An excellent account of the modern dramatic dances in traditional manner which may be seen at Angkor. Chiefly of value for the analyses of the romances, e. g. the stories of Prea Somut, and that of Prince Chey Chet, which form the theme of the representations.

A. K. COOMARASWAMY.

Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.

The Vision of Vāsavadattā. Edited with an Introduction, English Translation, Exegetical, Critical, Grammatical, Mythological, and Historical Notes by LAKSHMAN SARUP. Lahore: DAS BROTHERS, n. d. (? 1925). Pp. x + 78 + 2 + 86 + ii + 142. Rs. 4.

The translation of this play is made from a palm-leaf MS. written in old Malayalam characters. The translator states that the text is practically identical with the Trivandrum text, having only a very few unimportant variants. The MS. has the full title, Svapnavāsavadattam. The editor and translator agrees with Mr. T. Gaṇapati Śāstrī that the title of the Trivandrum text (Svapnanāṭakam) was an abbreviation of the full title.

The volume contains, besides the text and the translation of the play, the text and translation of all the known stanzas attributed to Bhāsa to be found in the various anthologies. The author also has included the text, with translation, of the extracts containing the legend of Udayana from the works of Buddhasvāmin, Kṣemendra, and Somadeva.

There is a very long introduction which goes extensively into the authorship of the thirteen plays which have been attributed to Bhāsa. By a cross-comparison of characters, stanzas, similar scenes, etc., the conclusion is reached that the plays are the work of one dramatist. The writer points out that the characters, Udayana, Vāsavadattā, and Yāugandharāyaṇa are exactly the same in the two plays, Svapnavāsavadattam and Pratijñā Yāugandharāyaṇam, and that Udayana and Vāsavadattā of these plays are very different from those characters in the Harṣa dramas. Another point of comparison made is a scene in Act II of the Pratijñā Yāugandharāyaṇam with a scene in Act I of the Avimārakam. These, the author says, are identical in their essence, and indeed they appear so. By these instances and many cross-comparisons of stanzas and dialogue the eleven long plays are connected. The writer has certainly made a very good case for attributing all of these plays to one person. He gives logical enough reasons, too, for believing that this dramatist was Bhāsa, though he seems, perhaps, a bit over-certain that his proofs are irrefutable. He puts Bhāsa's date in the early part of the second century A. D.

At the end of the volume are extensive notes which the author says are "elementary and chiefly meant for students." Taken as a whole, this book should be very useful to students of Sanskrit, and to any scholar making a special study of Bhāsa.

The English of the translation is easy and pleasing (though in places it is rather too free) and only occasionally do we find a word or phrase which would indicate that the translator is using a language not his mother-tongue. There are far too many misprints to permit them to go unmentioned.

Professor Lakshman Sarup states that in 1921 he had translated all of the thirteen plays. It is to be hoped that they may soon be published.

The Date of Kālidāsa. By KSHETREŚACHANDRA CHATTOPĀDHYĀYA. (Reprint from the *Allahabad University Studies*, Vol. II, pp. 78-170). Allahabad: INDIAN PRESS, LTD., LTD., 1926.

This very extensive treatment of the question of the date of Kālidāsa was first published in the second volume of the *Allahabad University Studies*. The author says his paper should be taken as a supplement to a paper by Mr. K. G. Sankara published in the second number (Vol. I) of the *Indian Historical Quarterly*.

The object of the paper is to present the author's reasons for his belief that Kālidāsa should be placed, not in the fourth or fifth century A. D. but in the first century B. C., and that Kālidāsa did not borrow from Aśvaghoṣa, as scholars have said, but that the borrowing was the other way about. The writer believes that Kālidāsa lived in the time of "Vikramāditya of Ujjayinī, avenger of Gardabhillā's overthrow." So sure is he of the stand he takes that he says, "if Kālidāsa is not removed from the fourth or fifth century A. D. Aśvaghoṣa will have to be brought down from the Kuṣāṇ period or all the passages in his works resembling Kālidāsa will have to be pronounced as post-Kālidāsean interpolations."

The author has given numerous passages from his texts, making his comparisons mainly between the Kumārasambhava and the

Buddhacarita and between the Raghuvamśa and the Sāundara-nanda. His knowledge of his subject and of the work done in this field by others is very thorough. Many of his arguments are reasonable, but that does not make them proofs. He complains that scholars have assumed and not proved that Kālidāsa borrowed from Aśvaghoṣa, and I fear that the same complaint will be made that this writer has not proved the contrary.

A review of this very scholarly paper could not really be fair to the author unless made by one who has a very intimate knowledge of the texts of these poets, which the present reviewer does not claim to have.

VIRGINIA SAUNDERS.

New York City.

LEANG K'I-TCH'AO (LIANG CH'I-CH'IAO) *La Conception de la Loi et les Théories des Légistes à la veille de Ts'in*. Traduction, Introduction et Notes par JEAN ESCARRA et ROBERT GERMAIN. Préface de GEORGES PADOUX. Pékin, China BOOKSELLERS LTD., 1926.

The year 1927 is notable in China for the deaths of two men who formed interesting links with the ideals and scholarship of the Manchu Dynasty. K'ang Yu-wei died at an advanced age; after the failure of the reforms of 1898, of which he was the leading inspiration, his fame was more or less overshadowed by the more radical reformers of the present. Wang Kuo-wei, a tutor in the "nan fang" ("south room") of the Emperor Hsuan T'ung, committed suicide in June, as a gesture of protest at the excesses of the Nationalists and in despair at the political situation. Both these men were scholars, old-school types, tho both were acquainted with the new learning, and Professor Wang surely will be remembered for his historical studies and for his research into Chinese drama.

This leaves but one prominent figure of the old school, Ku Hung-ming, whose brilliant and reactionary writings in English have made him widely known on the continent of Europe as spokesman for an ideal which never existed, but which is brilliantly conceived and expressed.

The connecting link between these two groups and the present is Liang Ch'i-ch'iao. Born in 1873, he was at 22 an ardent protagonist of reform, was proscribed, became a supporter of the idea of a constitutional monarchy and more than any one other Chinese journalist, prepared the way for the later and more drastic reforms of Sun Yat-sen. After periods in and out of office, after further journalistic and literary enterprises, he has retired to teach at the Research Institute of Tsing Hua and is now generally regarded by the more radical group of students as a reactionary. But he has done more for the advance of Chinese style than any other writer of the literary language now living, and has tried in every way to mediate between the ideas of the East and the West, tho he has not acquired the knowledge except by way of Japanese and travel. But Mr. Liang is a man of sparkling personality, a real intellectual force, a lover of the word, both spoken and written, and a sincere patriot. The present book represents the longest translation from any of his works into a foreign language and the names of the French sinologists on its title-page insure careful as well as brilliant work.

Both the preface and the introduction are extremely well written; they point out very clearly the difference in conception of the law between China and the Occident: the Chinese disregard for "La Loi positive," their adherence is to a natural law, based on an actual concord of all things under the sky, all of which is a complete reversal of the idea of the Roman code and all that it implies, tho it has some relation to the idea of the English common law. This whole discussion is extremely illuminating and paves the way for a better understanding of Mr. Liang's work, since it throws the latter into the proper perspective for an understanding of the continuity of the legalist attitude in China, even tho the school of "Legists" passed out of existence ages ago.

The introduction also sketches the history of this school of Chinese thought, contrasts it with the classical school of Confucius and shows the mutual relations of lending and borrowing of ideas between the two groups. There is also, in the introduction, a brief and sympathetic biography of Mr. Liang.

In Mr. Liang's first chapter, he traces the origin and conception of the idea of the law in China, and shows how law and punishments were closely related, if not synonymous, so that law applied

to the outer barbarians and to certain limited classes of Chinese only. This is an extremely interesting point and one which, if it had been understood, would have simplified the relations of the Chinese and foreigners in the pre-treaty days; it explains perfectly clearly such incidents as that of Terranova (1821), and provides a basis in theory for all the actions of the Chinese in the harried period before the Opium War, proving once more that, according to their lights, the Chinese were acting with perfect consistency, where to the angry foreigners, they seemed to be arbitrary and tyrannical.

The second chapter is a defense of the classic Confucian conception against the Legists. The conclusions are best summed up by a quotation from the work itself: "The Confucian school takes as its point of departure a conception of life which is living, spiritual, and filled with a soul; its doctrine of government leads back involuntarily to a doctrine of government by humanity, thence to that of government by men. The school of the Legists takes as its base the Taoistic concept of life, dead, soulless, mechanistic, and materialistic, and in the same manner leads to a government by the law and thence to government by things. Which is the better of the two schools needs, from my point of view, no long discussion to decide."

For those who, without a knowledge of Chinese, wish both an excellent discussion of the points involved and also a chance to see how modern Chinese scholarship shapes its thoughts and ideas, this work is to be recommended.¹

G. H. DANTON.

Oberlin, Ohio.

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel.
By JAMES A. MONTGOMERY. (The International Critical Commentary.) New York: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, 1927.
Pp. xxxi + 488.

One approaches a Commentary belonging to a series such as the International Critical Commentary with a double expectation: we should desire it to be a repertory of all that has been said in criticism and exegesis, and at the same time to present to the reader the author's own mind. Either point may be overdrawn. Com-

¹ Since the above was written, both Mr. Ku and Professor Liang have died.

mentators may revel in an orgy of citations from far and near, from old and new, anything and everything that has been written or printed; on the other hand, a commentator may unduly and immodestly push his own discoveries forward. There is also a third desideratum so rarely fulfilled. A biblical commentary should stress the religious side of the book interpreted—not after the manner of the apologetic kind nor of the expository sort, but with full justice to the religious attitude of the biblical writer. Judged by these three demands, Montgomery's *Commentary on Daniel* must be pronounced a capital work.

That the repertory is full may be judged by the copious bibliography with which the book opens. But as we read page by page and verse by verse we realize that the author has chosen wisely: his reticences are as eloquent as his communications. Everything has passed muster and only the relevant has been suffered to stay. The author avows a change of mind from positions at first approved. On page 9 he informs us that years ago he had hailed a certain view as correct; but 'subsequent cooler consideration has made him renounce it, not for reasons philological or critical but dramatic.' The questions concerning the character of the Hebrew and of the Aramaic of Daniel are argued as between those who defend an early date and those who would descend to a late period, and in each case (pp. 15, 20) the author gives his own conclusion. Against Driver, who, on the basis of the Greek words, 'too positively' puts the composition of the book after Alexander the Great, Montgomery prefers 'to express his opinion in terms of likelihood' (p. 23). There are poetic passages in the book, but the writer would not go as far as Marti (*ibid.*). He agrees with Bludau that a careful study relieves much of the odium that has been cast upon the oldest Greek version; and we believe him fully when he tells us that his opinion was independently attained (p. 36), since both the Introduction and the Commentary proper reveal what immense labor was expended by the author on the Greek versions (Septuagint, Theodotion), their text and recensions, the text underlying them and the manner in which the original was interpreted, all on a scale heretofore hardly attempted with such attention to detail and cogency of reasoning. He rightly stamps Jahn's retroversion of the Greek into Hebrew throughout the book (the Aramaic portions included) as a schoolboy's 'exercise in Hebrew composition' (p. 37); when he adds 'which may be left

to Jewish *literati*,' the reviewer would conclude the sentence by saying 'who would not do it any the better or worse'. Admirable is the summary concerning the vexed question of the 'Ur-Theodotion'. 'That there existed some such body of received translation before the Christian age lies beyond doubt; but we must not too quickly assume a written version' (p. 50). As between the traditionists who assign the book to the sixth century B. C. and the critics who place it in the Hellenistic age, 'on the ground of the apparent impossibility of the two parties coming to terms or even understanding one another, this Comm. must pursue its own line of logical development, meeting, respectfully, if often too summarily, the opposing views on its way' (p. 58). 'Critics have erred in too rigorously adjudging Apocalyptic as late, and Gressmann and Gunkel are right in trying to correct the balance' (p. 79). Thus Montgomery is of the opinion that the first part of the book (chapters 1-6) is earlier than 7-12 and belongs to the third century (p. 80; then especially 88-91). He views Apocalyptic not as an 'Abart', but as a legitimate development of Prophecy (p. 81). The whole question of the influence of Parsism 'is sorely complicated and rendered most uncertain by the doubts as to the age of the Parsee documents' (p. 85). 'The sources of the Persian religion are operated with in as uncritical a way as if in the O. T. a critic should accept J and P indifferently for the Mosaic age' (p. 86). Montgomery rejects Behrmann's opinion that the book is a product of Essenism; but he rightly takes it as a monument of primitive Hasidism, more specifically representing 'the principled pacifistic wing of the party' (p. 87). If, as the author avers, there is a solitary reference in the book to Judas' enterprise which is rebuked because of its 'worldly complications' then one is really justified in looking upon this point as the very essence of the second half of the book: a conscious attitude of opposition to the Party of Judas who would bring about deliverance from the yoke of the heathen by human efforts instead of waiting for the divine redemption to come 'with the clouds of heaven'. This attitude, of course, is that of strict Jewish orthodoxy, and examples may be cited from subsequent periods of Jewish history down to the present day. The 'problem of the two languages' is stated, but no definite conclusion is forced upon the reader (p. 90 ff.). Similarly the question whether chapter 7 is a distinct composition is left open (p. 95). The difficulty of the reckoning of the three

and one-half years is solved in a manner which 'may be satisfactory neither to the theologian nor to the historian' (p. 98). Section 22 contains an appreciation of the literary and religious character of the book which reveals a fine sense for both. The religious problem in the third century and later was 'far more difficult, complex, apparently hopeless, than confronted an Isaiah or Jeremiah. In the Hellenistic age God's world had become a vast, unified, articulated Cosmos, in the Johannine sense, tremendously interesting, intellectual, artistic, beautiful, but also cruel and beastly, religious in the sense of superstitious, or else sceptical and atheistic, godless in the sum. . . . To this condition our bk. made answer . . . founded foursquare on the centuries-old belief that "God is king, be the earth never so inquiet" (p. 101 f.). Correct is also the observation with reference to the Visions in the book that 'the faith was prophetic and the Religion was saved, although not in the terms of the prediction, as is always the case with both Prophecy and Apocalyptic' (p. 103). Such indeed is the case; witness Malachi who awaited none other than Elijah come back to earth to lead a corrupt generation to rectitude and faith—Elijah did not come, instead of him came Ezra and Nehemiah who restored Mosaism; or Isaiah looking for the advent of the Messiah in his own day, possibly in the person of Hezekiah—Hezekiah was far from a Messianic character, and so was Josiah, but they made their contribution to safeguarding the religion, as Montgomery would say, the 'Old Dispensation' (comp. p. 101).

The Commentary proper is replete with information and balanced judgment. Daniel offers so many questions, textual, linguistic, exegetical, critical, and in all of these the author of this Commentary approves himself a guide to the student. The reviewer may be permitted a few annotations jotted down in reading. P. xxiii: the 1922 volume of Perles' *Analekten* is not a 'second edition', but a new part ('*Neue Folge*'). P. 3: if Ben Sira does not mention Daniel among the Prophets, this would prove that Daniel was not accounted a prophet by the Synagogue; moreover, the book in its present form is later than Ben Sira who in his *Praise of the Fathers of Antiquity* follows the Scriptural books as far as they had been collected and ordered by his time. It is pertinent, however, to remark that, although Ben Sira mentions Job immediately after Ezekiel, hence probably, even if we read *אזכיר* for *הזכיר*, because of Ezekiel's reference to Job, no mention is

made of Daniel, apparently because Ben Sira knew of no book going by his name as part of the canon. P. 7: the term *pasûk-pathûh* is unknown to the reviewer. P. 23: the author assumes Greek influence in the use of גוי; on what grounds? P. 25: read *Verzeichniss*. P. 27: read *zuqninensis*. P. 28: because a translation has little bearing upon the text, that is, offers a minimum of variation from the received text, it is so much the more important for the very confirmation of the latter; the textual student must have his eye on agreement no less than on disagreement; the received text itself needs attestation and such it gets at the hands of the later translators. P. 37: the same combination with רמין 'similitude' was indulged in by the translator of Jeremiah in three places out of four for דמן 'dung'. P. 101: the author calls the depiction of characters a weak point in Oriental romance; perhaps so from the point of view of the modern, but this very restraint in Oriental and specifically biblical tales is usually looked upon as a strong point. P. 113: the assumption that the translator found in his Hebrew text ויוליכרו is not necessary; merely an improvement according to sense. P. 117: מרדוח with dagesh lene because from ררה. P. 129, first line: supply 'König' in front of *Hwb*. P. 142: read נחליתי for the misprint נחלמתי. P. 163: why should bad readings like הָעֵלְנִי or הָעֵלְנִי be called 'Hebraizing'? P. 174, l. 12 from the top: is קמין correct? P. 182, l. 11 from the top: for 'lords' read 'kings'. P. 203, l. 5 from top: for 'triagon' read 'trigon'. P. 227 in the citation from Ibn Ezra my copy (Warsaw Rabbinic Bible) has not ריעה which Montgomery renders 'excretion', but ריע 'friend, associate', the phrase is the usual one to denote a word occurring in the Bible but once; see Preface to the Authorized Version, third paragraph from the end. P. 300, l. 4: for בימין read בימים.

Les parlers judéo-romans et la Vetus Latina. D. S. BLONDHEIM.
Paris: EDOUARD CHAMPION, 1925. Pp. cxxxviii + 247.

The book includes matter previously published by the author; new are the first two chapters of the Introduction (pp. ix-xcvii), Appendix A (pp. 136-156), the Indices. It would have greatly ministered to unity had the new and old been welded together; the reader, 'perplexed by the disparate character of the subjects treated,' is advised by the author to study the summaries on pp.

ix-xi and 1-2 and more in detail on pp. cxxxii-cxxxviii before tackling the remainder of the volume.

This advice cannot be followed if one wishes to do justice to the wealth of material assembled and to the methodical but nevertheless not easily compressible argumentation in favor of certain theses maintained by the author. Blondheim has carved out for himself a subject in which he had, to be sure, predecessors but which, as regards completeness and surety of the philological touch, he alone at the present moment masters. The subject is an assembly and grammatico-lexical appreciation of the Romanic vocables and expressions found in medieval Jewish literature. One obtains in the present publication a valuable but none the less small excerpt from that larger and comprehensive work which we hope will not be long delayed. One must be grateful to an author who, while engaged in a *magnum opus*, from time to time permits the learned world to see from specimens what may be expected from the finished work. But would it not be better if that stupendous work were hastened?

The subject of Latin *sermo vulgaris* is naturally cultivated by Romanists. Professor Blondheim is at home in this field. He is, by the way, at home in many contiguous fields, and so great is his modesty and fear of being accused of trespassing that he not only cites chapter and verse for every statement but also encumbers text and notes with acknowledgments to living scholars—sometimes quite exaggeratedly. By the nature of the Jewish-Romanic expressions, largely but not altogether ecclesiastical, the author was led to study in particular words which cover biblical equivalents. He found that, though their record dates from late medieval periods, there is ground for tracing them to high antiquity; thus the thesis is put forth that between early and late periods there is an unbroken continuity of tradition. Another thesis propounded by the author is to the effect that the Old Latin translation which in the Church preceded the Vulgate (the latter, according to the author, representing but a revision of the older version) has points of contact with Jewish Latin expressions justifying, in the author's opinion, the assumption that not impossibly a Jewish Latin version of the Hebrew Scriptures antedated the Christian version. Of course, the author realizes that that there is extant neither trace nor memory of a Jewish Latin version; the abstract polemic as to whether such a version may have existed leads nowhere. But

there is no gainsaying that there existed among Latin-speaking Jews an oral translation—the oral Targum precedes the written everywhere; and this oral translation was accessible to the Church translators, whether they were Jews converted to Christianity or Christians in intercourse with Jews. It is worthy of note that expressions like *cena pura* for παρασκευή ‘Preparation’ or προσάββαρον ‘the day before the sabbath,’ for which there is direct attestation that they were in vogue among the Jews, do not seem to be of unmistakably Jewish origin. The author approves (p. lix) the statement that the term *cena pura* originated among the pagans—‘offa porcina in cinis puris’ would not be served at a Friday night meal among Jews—and there does not appear a Hebrew or Aramaic phrase of which it might be the equivalent. Still the Jews in Africa did call Friday *cena pura*, though it has not survived in Jewish Romanic (p. lx), and since the *Vetus Latina* uses it likewise the author is right in linking up the latter with Jewish associations. The reviewer has not tested the entire list of such words or expressions common to the Old Latin and the Jews. But *bona dies* Esther 9, 22 should have been left out of the question; for there the Latin merely reproduces ἀγαθή ἡμέρα of the Greek.

A word might also be said on the author’s thesis that the literalism of the *Vetus Latina* points to Jewish influence, on the assumption that the Jews were addicted to literalism. In the case of biblical or theological terms the assumption may be right; but as a general proposition it will not commend itself. The earliest books of the Bible translated into Greek were by no means literal productions; witness Genesis or Joshua. Aquila’s effort was a *tour de force*.

A great deal of information has been gathered by the author in the two Appendices dealing with the influence of Arabic on the Jewish Romanic biblical versions and of the Septuagint and Aquila on Jewish versions in Neo-Greek. The margin of Codex F (p. 161) does contain matter ascending to Jewish tradition, as e.g. Joshua 2, 1 a. e. κατήλυσσα for וניח (comp. Targum), but also scholia of Christian origin.

One cannot part from the book without the feeling of having learned much that is solid erudition and of having been stimulated throughout.

- I. *Al-Mu'jam al-'Aṣri fī al-Inkilizi w-al-'Arabi* (Centennial English-Arabic Dictionary of the American Press of Beirūt). By KHALĪL SA'D, PAUL ERDMAN and AS'AD KHAYRALLAH. Beirūt, Syria: AMERICAN MISSION PRESS, 1926. Pp. 1058.
- II. *Al-Dhikra*, being a translation in poetry of Tennyson's *In Memoriam*. By ANĪS KHŪRĪ AL-MAQDISĪ, Professor of Arabic Literature at the American University of Beirūt. Beirūt, Syria: AMERICAN PRESS, 1925. Pp. 184.
- III. *Al-'Uṣūr al-Qadimah*, being a translation of Breasted's *Ancient Times*. By DĀWŪD QURBĀN, Professor of Arabic at the American University of Beirūt. AMERICAN PRESS, 1926. Pp. 487.

The American Mission Press of Beirūt, whose output throughout its hundred years of existence has been mainly religious, has recently treated us to three scholarly productions of the "secular" type.

I. The *English-Arabic Dictionary* was prepared in celebration of the hundredth anniversary of the Press. The basis of this dictionary is the 1922 edition of Webster's *New International Dictionary* and a total of over 35,000 words has been included. The book is meant to meet the needs of the students of English in the Arabic-speaking East as well as the English-speaking foreigners studying Arabic.

One feature of the work is the inclusion of many Arabic colloquial words and newly coined terms, built up regularly on Arabic roots which might be correctly used as equivalents for certain English words for which there are no true Arabic equivalents. Such new Arabic derivatives are preceded by the word *yasiḥḥ*. If there are any other features which distinguish this dictionary from previously issued dictionaries which already occupy the field, such as Abkarius, Hava, Elias, etc., the reviewer has failed to notice them. Of course, it is larger than those; but no etymologies are given, no illustrations are used, and no attempt to cover the new and scientific terms is made. An Arabic-speaking student would look up "mohair" and memorize its given meaning in Arabic, *al-mir'izz*, *ghazl*, *albaka*, without getting the least inkling of the

fact that after all the English word he is looking up is nothing but a corruption of Arabic *mukhayyar*, nor would he, from the Arabic definition, recognize *al-qubbah* in "alcove."

On the whole, the rendition of the words is accurate, though in a few cases checked up by the reviewer, the Arabic was either obscure or incomplete. "Mussel" rendered simply *umm al-khulūl* can convey no concept whatsoever to the mind of the ordinary student. To "jargon" rendered *laghaṭ, rutayniy, laghu* should be added *lahjah*.

It is becoming more and more clear that lexicography is not the work of individuals but of academies or large committees on which mathematicians, physicists, historians, theologians and so forth, in addition to linguists and philologists, are adequately represented. The English-Arabic field still awaits such a dictionary.

II. Professor al-Maqdisi's translation is introduced by a brief sketch of the life of the great Victorian poet-laureate, and a discussion of his immortal poem *In Memoriam*. Each section is prefaced by a statement of its theme in prose and is supplied with footnotes indicating the variation from the English original and explaining the difficult points. Considering the well-nigh insurmountable difficulties inherent in the nature of the task which al-Maqdisi has taken upon himself, he should be commended on the measure of success he achieved; for an attempt of this kind, even at its best, is a failure. Real poetry defies rendition into another tongue, especially when the two tongues are Arabic and English, so different in their genius and methods of expressing thought. Even the recent translation of some of Shakespeare's works by the greatest Syrian-Egyptian poet, Khalil Muṭrān, proved a dismal failure. The only recent case of unquestioned success is that of the *Iliad* by Sulaymān al-Bustāni (Cairo, 1905).

In *al-Dhikra* justice has been done to many passages. In others the emphasis was shifted, or an original shade of meaning was missed. No one with an equal feeling for both English and Arabic, if such a thing could be, could get out of the Arabic anything like the thrill and the inspiration he is likely to get out of the easy flowing and sublime song "Ring out," "ring in." Al-Maqdisi has nevertheless rendered a real service to modern Arabic literature. He has set a sample that would serve to open

the eyes of the Arabic poets unfamiliar with European languages, who are on the whole verbose and superficial, to the high aims and ideals of modern Western poetry.

The following transliteration of the first stanza of the poem, beginning with "Strong Son of God," will serve as an illustration of the meter and the general tenor of the Arabic translation:

*Ayyuha-l-ḥubbu fi sama'i-l-khulūdi,
Ya-bna rabbi-l-akwāni dha-l-sultāni,
Lam nushāhidka naḥnu fi dha-l- wujūdi
Sāfiri-l-wajhi bādiyan li'ayāni;
Ghayra anna-l-iy māna yuhdi khuṭāna,
Wayuriyna ma la tara-l'-aynāni.*

III. *Al-'Uṣūr al-Qadimah* marks a new epoch in the history of American education in the Arabic East. Heretofore English was the language of instruction in the American institutions. Arabic, the native language, is now, and has been since the war, forging ahead as a substitute; and the first step would naturally be to translate English textbooks into Arabic. The second stage would undoubtedly be characterized by more and more dependence upon original Arabic books written by native scholars trained in the Western methods of scientific research.

No more fortunate choice could perhaps have been made in ushering this new era than in this book under review, both from the standpoint of the book itself, rightly considered one of the masterpieces of modern historical textbooks, and of the translator whose mastery of the intricacies of modern Arabic is probably unexcelled by any other Arabic scholar. Qurbān has fully justified his reputation and produced a book which is likely to stamp its style, diction and terminology upon the plastic minds of the young Arabic students and serve as a model for other Arabic texts. The reviewer has compared a great part of the translation with the original and found to his disappointment—rather to his delight—that he could hardly "catch" the translator in any place. The rendition is honest but not slavish. The language is modern, rather than classical, but correct; beautiful but not pedantic. Here and there is a word that may be improved upon. *Al-jawwālāh* (pp. 33, 35, 43) for someone "wandering" is too strong; *al-sā'ih*

comes nearer to it. *Malik* (p. 43) for "noble" is not right; *sharīf* is the word. "Clerstory" and "nave" (p. 49) were somehow or other avoided in the translation. "The library of Assurnazirpal" under Fig. 79, p. 123, should read "the library of Assurbanipal." It is a pity that no attempt was made to Arabicize such words as "Amen," "Amenhotep" (pp. 65, 67), etc. We also regret that the editor, Professor Nelson, a former student of Breasted, who in the introduction (page *b*) says that he tried "to adapt the book to the needs of the Arabic-speaking students," did not adapt it enough by giving more space to the ancient Semitic history and background and by inserting new paragraphs regarding the ancient Arab civilization of Ḥimyar, Petra, Palmyra, Ghassān, etc. The table of contents shows that about 140 pages are devoted to the ancient Oriental world and 313 to the Græco-Roman world. When a second edition is made, and we hope it will soon be made, this defect should be remedied.

PHILIP K. HITT.

Princeton University.

Hsuntze; the Moulder of Ancient Confucianism. By H. H. DUBS.
London: PROBSTHAIN, 1927. Pp. xxi + 306. 24 s.

The west, and particularly America, has been singularly uninterested in the real study of Chinese culture and thought. Therefore it is a hopeful sign that an American has attempted a study of one of the great Chinese thinkers, and that this introductory book is to be followed by a translation of the Chinese text of Hsuntze. In spite of the importance of Hsuntze, no adequate study of his work has existed in any European language, as Dr. Dubs points out, and no better man could have been chosen as a subject for investigation, since a really authoritative account of this thinker is essential to a thorough understanding of Chinese civilization. Dr. Dubs is to be congratulated upon his courageous attempt.

Unfortunately, the effort cannot be regarded as satisfactory. The style is not what one could wish, and the thought is often muddy. The book abounds in careless and misleading statements that damage confidence in those portions where one would like to accept Dr. Dubs as an authority.

There is no basis whatever for the statement (p. 40) that Con-

fucius wrote any of the speeches in the Book of History. Lao Tze did not equate Heaven and Tao (p. 61), but clearly placed Tao first. It is very misleading to say that Hsuntze "eliminated God" (p. 63); that he is as orthodox as Mencius (p. 79), which is contrary to the almost universal judgment of the Chinese; that Jen, or Benevolence, was introduced by Confucius as a new principle in Chinese thought (p. 125); that the Chinese are not given to asceticism (p. 169), when their history is full of hermits and monks; that the Book of Changes is late, and was made a classic because it had been esteemed by Ts'in Shih Huang (p. 190); that the works of all thinkers earlier than Lao Tze have been lost (p. 198); that "the problem of the universal and the particular considered as real entities had not arisen in China" (p. 233); that all philosophies but the Confucian "were entirely forgotten by the intellectual world of China" until the last generation (p. 241); that there were no powerful enemies who could attack China (p. 256), which is sufficiently disproved by the Great Wall as well as by history; that law had not developed in the China of Hsuntze (p. 260), when Li Kuei was much earlier; that Tsao Tsao is popular in China (p. 271), when as a matter of fact he is regarded as one of the three great traitors in Chinese history; and, lastly, that in all essentials Hsuntze and Mencius agree (p. 291). These statements, where not absolutely false, are so misleading as to destroy one's faith in the accuracy and reliability of Dr. Dubs' scholarship, and sometimes he contradicts them himself in the succeeding sentences.

Frequently Dr. Dubs rushes in where angels might hesitate. He says (p. xxii) that a section of the Book of Rites is a direct quotation from Hsuntze, and there are similar statements on pages 136 and 144. The question as to who did the quoting has always puzzled Chinese scholarship, and Hu Shih, who is the authority for much of Dr. Dubs' book, says in his history of Chinese philosophy (p. 306) that he is unable to decide the matter.

What is Dr. Dubs' authority for the assertion (p. 139) that Micius "was a hard working government official"? Practically nothing is known about the details of his life.

Dr. Dubs is rash in attributing a Platonic theory of ideas to the Tao Teh Ching. The passage on which this statement is based seems to be nothing more than a statement of relativity. On the other hand, in treating Confucius, who did formulate a theory

resembling Plato's, Dr. Dubs fails to understand his thought (p. 201). The sage is not quibbling about the use of terms when he says "A drinking horn that is not a horn," or better, "A sacrificial vessel without corners." His meaning is that a ruler, for instance, is required by Heaven to possess certain qualities, and when these are lacking, he does not have the reality behind the name.

Moreover, Dr. Dubs utterly fails to grasp the significance of the argument about the Nature in Chinese thought. This discussion begins with the opening sentence of the Doctrine of the Mean, "What Heaven has conferred is called the Nature." It was followed by Yang Chu's startling statement that the nature of man is to seek sense pleasures. Against such a doctrine Mencius replied that all men have implanted in them by Heaven certain good qualities, such as benevolence and sympathy. Even the most depraved man cannot see a child about to fall into a well without feelings of alarm. Not only the Chinese, but western philosophers, like Sidgwick, have recognized the futility of attempting to construct a utilitarian system of ethics without some such assumption as that of Mencius.

Yet Hsuntze discards the Mencian position for an arbitrary external authority set up by society, and thereby gives away the whole case for virtue. It is no wonder that the Chinese have condemned his position, and Dr. Dubs is unjust in blaming it all on Chu Hsi, for the criticism was made long before Chu Hsi's time. In saying that the Nature is evil, Hsuntze either failed to understand Mencius, or he considered Heaven to be evil, or he had no place among orthodox Confucians. This conclusion is a commonplace in China.

There is no space to analyse the book completely. Injustice is done to Mencius, Lieh Tze, who forms an important link in the development of Chinese thought, is not mentioned at all; Chuang Tze is treated inadequately, and there is no critical appraisal of Hsuntze himself. In the title of the book, and throughout its pages, Hsuntze is given entirely too much credit. Many statements are made as if they were peculiarly true of Hsuntze, such as the one on page 85 that he made "History the vehicle of moral instruction," which are equally true of practically all Chinese writers. To call a man "the Moulder of Ancient Confucianism"

when the overwhelming weight of Chinese scholarship holds him to be a heretic, and not to give any convincing proof for this judgment, is hardly according to the "Rules of Propriety" which govern critical scholarship. The book attempts to justify its hero rather than to value him.

Perhaps it is unnecessary to call attention to further deficiencies. There are mistakes in Chinese characters on pages xxv, 26, and 111. On page 111, the characters for Yi, or Justice, and Hsin, or Faithfulness, are interchanged. On page 17, a Chinese proper name is romanized as Kung Suen-lung. The surname of this philosopher is not Kung, but consists of two characters, and should be written as Kung-sun Lung. Other illustrations of surnames of two characters are Szi-ma Ch'ien, Chu-k'o Liang and Ou-yang Hsiu.

In general, the reviewer regrets that although great praise is due to Dr. Dubs for his effort, the book fails to live up to the hopes which its title inspires. It is full of mistakes, uncritical judgments and careless writing, while the author fails to grasp the intellectual problems which the men he treats attacked.

J. K. SHRYOCK.

University of Pennsylvania.

Iran. Vol. I, 1926. Published by the ACADEMY OF SCIENCES OF U. S. S. R. Leningrad, 1927. Pp. 8 + 260.

Apparently scientific journals in Russia are beginning to revive. Thus, after an interval two volumes of the *Memoirs of the Committee of Orientalists* have been published in the place of the *Memoirs of the Oriental Section of the Archaeological Society*. Moreover there has recently appeared the first volume of a new publication entitled *Iran*. It is quite possible that this journal will partly replace *The World of Islam*, which ceased to appear some years ago; they have the same editor—W. Barthold. The program of the *World of Islam* was larger and its contents were more popular. The new journal, as the editor says, will be consecrated to Iranistics in the widest meaning of this word and its appearance is justified by the merits of the Russian scholars in this field: the names of P. Lerch, C. Salemann, and V. Zhukovsky are mentioned; we must add to them that of W. Barthold himself. Unfortunately, we have in the preface a very ominous sentence:

"... Periodical publication, if it will succeed in securing its existence."

The name of such an Orientalist as Barthold, as editor, is, of course, more or less, a guarantee of the seriousness of material. Among the authors of the volume under consideration we meet the names of the already well known Russian Orientalists, A. Freiman, F. Rosenberg, A. Semenoff; we have also representatives of the new generation, E. Berthels, R. Vasmer, J. Zarubin; besides there are two new names, Mrs. Kratchkovsky and R. Galunoff. The articles are seven; among them two deal with history; the others are devoted one each to poetry, linguistics, ethnology, theology, and art. Moreover, there are an obituary note and some reviews.

Two articles are from the pen of the editor: one concerning the Soghdian and Tokharian languages, the other dealing with the origin of the Darband-Namah. In the first the author, with his usual erudition, discusses almost unknown material which has great importance for the history of Central Asia. Reading this article we must express the oft-repeated formula: it is extremely unfortunate that several works on Central Asia, published in Russian, remain unknown to foreign specialists; that happened earlier (1873) with the *History of Chinese Turkestan* by Grigorieff, it is now (1926) true of the work of K. Inostrantzeff on the origin of the Huns. In his second article Prof. Barthold re-examines the question of the lost manuscript on the history of the city of Darband.

The largest article in size, 90 pages, is the work of Mr. Zarubin. It is a study of the Iranian dialect Munjani, with a vocabulary and index. E. Berthels gives us a sketch of the biography and poetry of a Persian poet of the 17th century, Muhsin Faiz Kashani. In this work the author used a hitherto unknown manuscript of this poet, which is preserved in the Asiatic Museum at Petrograd. In consequence of the revival of the Ismailite movement in India, A. Semenoff in his article "The Point of View of the Eastern Ismailites on the Koran" discusses the regard of the Ismailites for the Koran on the basis of the work "The Face of Faith" written by Nasiri Khosraw, the apostle of the Ismailites of Pamir. Very curious material for ethnology and folklore is found in the article of Mr. Galunoff. There are collected in it the couplets, songs, and sayings used by the Persians in the training of fighters. Mrs. Kratchkovsky, the wife of the well known Russian

Arabist, describes a *mihrab*, or Mohammedan prayer-niche, preserved in the Hermitage Museum.

The obituary note of Christian Bartholomae is written by Dr. Freiman in a very warm style which shows the thankful love of a disciple for his teacher; it is supplied with a detailed bibliography of the works of the late scholar. For American Orientalists it is interesting to note the quotation that Bartholomae esteemed very highly (p. 206) "the American Iranist Jackson" (A. V. Williams Jackson, Professor at Columbia University).

All five critical reviews are written in an exceedingly violent style. In some it is quite justified. For instance the reviews by A. Semenoff of the edition of the works of Nasiri Khosraw, published by the Persians in Berlin (sic!), or the note of F. Rosenberg concerning the bad and incorrect French translation by Paul Budry of the book of E. Kühnel on the oriental miniature. Sometimes the ferocity of the reviews must be ascribed to the youthful ardor of the reviewers.

Let us hope that *Iran*, under its experienced editorship, will give a series of important works—if it succeeds in escaping the danger mentioned in the preface.

N. MARTINOVITCH.

Columbia University.

Etymologisches Wörterbuch der europäischen (germanischen, romanischen und slavischen) Wörter orientalischen Ursprungs Indogermanische Bibliothek, Erste Abteilung, II. Reihe: Wörterbücher, 3). Von KARL LOKOTSCH. Heidelberg: CARL WINTER'S UNIVERSITÄTSBUCHHANDLUNG, 1927. Pp. xxii + 242. In paper, 13 Mk.; bound, 15 Mk.

In the "Vorwort," Dr. Lokotsch gives a summary history of the coming of Oriental words into the European languages, in the main, either through Greek and Latin, or through the spread of Islam, or by the recent movements of colonization. The words of the first group reached the classics by the agency of the Persian Wars, next by the campaigns of Alexander, finally by the spread of Judaism and the rise of Christianity. The Islamic influence was exerted first in the West, through Arabic, and later in the East, through Turkish.

The articles in the dictionary proper are alphabetized by the source-words, which are numbered, to 2235; an examination shows

that in the first fifth of the list, over twenty oriental languages are represented. Pages 177-242 give indexes of words quoted in the articles, arranged by languages, including seven Romanic dialects, six Slavic, five Germanic, also Arabic, Assyrian, Greek, Hebrew, Malay, Latin, Syrian, and Aramaic. On what basis these are included and many other oriental languages excluded, the reviewer does not know. The modern European languages most numerous represented are Roumanian, Spanish, French, Portuguese, German, Italian, English, Russian—an interesting preëminence of the Romanic tongues.

It is difficult to criticize such a study in detail; but the index of English words reveals several facts. The author often quotes a single derivative word in several spellings: *nargeela* (spelled *nargula* in the article, No. 1556), *narghile*, *nargileh*; *pajamas*, *pyjamas*, *pyjamma* (here the variation between British and American justifies the inclusion of the first two forms); *sandal*, *sandle*; *seapoy*, *sepoy*; *tarboosh*, *tarbouche*; *tattoo*, *tattow*; etc. Inferior forms are given sometimes, to the exclusion of the preferred forms: *kandy* is given, but not *candy*; *khakee*, but not *khaki*; *jennyrickshaw*, but not *jinrikisha* or *jinricksha*; *rouble*, but not *ruble*. *Parasang*, of Persian origin, does not appear for any language; English *faro* is omitted under No. 1650, and *damson* is not to be found under No. 476. The loss of the initial *n* in the word which became Italian *arancia* is not explained, though it is well understood; No. 1555.

A consideration of the English examples shows that Dr. Lokotsch is not sufficiently at home in English to exercise discrimination among the spellings, though any of the larger dictionaries of recent date might have guided him. On the other hand, we must recall the gigantic nature of the task which he undertook: it includes practically all the languages of Asia, the East Indies, and North Africa, as well as those of Europe. No scholar can master them all. But the collections in this volume are of prime importance for those who wish to work on special points of recondite word-origins.

Incidentally, the journal in which this review appears is the only American publication listed in the bibliography, but there is no citation of Schoff's article, *JAOS.* 42. 355-370, on *camphor*, under No. 1100.

ROLAND G. KENT.

University of Pennsylvania.

MINOR NOTICES

L'Inde et son âme. Écrits des Grands Penseurs de l'Inde Contemporaine. C. A. HÖGMAN, Éditeur. Boulogne-sur-Seine: Publications Chitra. [1928.] 504 pp.

This is a useful book, well worth the attention of those who are interested in the literary, artistic, and spiritual life of contemporary India. Its plan is primarily to let Indian leaders in each of these fields speak for themselves. There are characteristic writings of such men and women as Gandhi, Rabindranath and Abanindranath Tagore, Sarojini Naidu, Jawaharlal Nehru, and others; brief biographic studies of leading Indians; essays on Indian art, music, philosophy, and religion (in part by westerners, but only by such as have an intimate and sympathetic acquaintance with India); an extensive and varied section on "Women in India", with contributions by Indian and European women and men; specimens of folklore, proverbs, and semi-popular (as well as more literary) poetry; an account of Tagore's Viśva-Bharati University; and so forth. The inclusion of some writings by such westerners as Charles F. Andrews and Sir John Woodroffe does not constitute a serious departure from the announced intention to let Indians present their own case; on the contrary, it adds strength to the book, by showing concretely that serious and noble-hearted occidentals find much in India that is worthy both of study and of loving admiration. All the materials in the book are presented in French translations, which, so far as a non-Frenchman can judge, seem to be competent.

NOTES OF THE SOCIETY

The following persons have been elected to membership in the Society by vote of the Executive Committee:

Prof. Alfred R. Bellinger
Miss Elsie Benkard
Rabbi Morton M. Berman
Prof. Lyman V. Cady
Sir Atul Chatterjee
Mr. John H. Denison
Prof. John Dow
Mr. Henry C. Fenn
Dr. Joshua Finkel
Prof. W. M. Fouts
Rabbi Hirsch L. Freund
Prof. Esson M. Gale
Mr. Luther C. Goodrich
Dr. Hirsch Loeb Gordon
Mr. Solomon Grayzel
Pres. Franklin S. Harris
Dr. Archibald C. Harte
Mr. Eugene E. Hibshman

Prof. Elijah J. James
Dr. Charles Penrose Keith
Prof. Carroll B. Malone
Miss Wanden Mathews
Rev. Theodore Mayer
Pres. G. Bromley Oxnam
Rabbi Herbert Parzen
Prof. K. Rama Pisharoti
Pres. Cass Arthur Reed
Prof. Frank H. Ridgley
Prof. Dorothy B. Robinson
Rabbi Nachman Sarnoff
Prof. Martin Sprengling
Dr. Mary H. Swindler
Mr. Ahmad Kasrawi Tabrizi
Prof. Rollin H. Tanner
Rabbi Sidney E. Unger
Dr. Olive M. Winchester

In accordance with By-Law VIII, the Executive Committee has dropped from the list of members of the Society Mrs. Harold D. Kindt.

The vote concerning publicity service by the ACLS (JOURNAL, 48, 323) has been rescinded, at the suggestion of Dr. Leland, the Permanent Secretary, and because the ACLS is not continuing the arrangement for securing publicity for the constituent Societies.

NOTES OF OTHER SOCIETIES

"A Linguistic Society of India has just been founded. The founders include A. C. Woolner, S. K. Chatterjee, Siddhesvar Varma and J. S. Taporevala; and the Society will be strictly competent and up to date. It proposes to publish six times a year a small bulletin consisting chiefly of notes, queries, and reviews, and in addition it will publish occasional monographs of research of permanent value. The purposes of the Society are primarily the scientific study of the languages of India, ancient and modern, thus including the study of hitherto unstudied dialects; and, secondly, the modernization of the teaching of languages in India."—Extract from a letter of Professor W. Norman Brown, dated Lahore, Nov. 23, 1928.

PERSONALIA

The address of Prof. JOHN F. B. CARRUTHERS, wrongly given in the last List of Members, is 1015 Prospect Boulevard, Pasadena, Calif.

The address of Prof. E. A. SPEISER (omitted in the List) is University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

THE UPANIṢADS: WHAT DO THEY SEEK, AND WHY? ¹

FRANKLIN EDGERTON

YALE UNIVERSITY

It may seem presumptuous at this late day to suggest that a restatement is needed of the fundamental attitude of the Upaniṣads, those fountain-heads of all classical Hindu thought. After all that has been written on the subject by so many distinguished scholars and brilliant thinkers, both eastern and western, surely it would seem that at least the general intellectual view-point of these famous treatises must be fairly clear and fairly familiar. In one sense it is. The detailed dogmatic beliefs of the Upaniṣads which we recognize as philosophical or religious have been, on the whole, sufficiently sifted, classified, arranged, and interpreted. That is, it is easy to find in our reference-books comprehensive statements of what they say about the nature of the world and its guiding principle, the nature of man, his origin, his duty, his destiny, and his relation to the outside world and its Supreme Principle. I do not mean that no further study of these matters is required. Problems still remain. But I am not now attempting to solve them; and they are mostly problems of detail. What I am now concerned with is a more general and more fundamental matter, and one which has been commonly ignored by modern writers, both Hindu and western. The few who have referred to it seem to me not to have given it its proper place in relation to the philosophy, that is the dogmatic theories, of the Upaniṣads.

I refer to the instinctive and unquestioning belief in the inherent power of *knowledge*, as such, which underlies the whole intellectual fabric of the Upaniṣads, as it appears to me, and furnishes the motive force behind their speculations. Typical passages found constantly in all parts of them seem to me to make it abundantly clear that the reason why they seek the "truth," any truth, is precisely this, that by *knowledge* of the truth they expect to master their destiny, wholly or partly; and not by a course of action dictated by that knowledge, but directly, immediately, and by virtue

¹ Presidential address delivered before the American Oriental Society at its annual meeting in Cambridge, April 2, 1929.

of that knowledge in itself; in brief, we may say, magically. In this paper I shall try to suggest the range of evidence supporting this view, and also to sketch briefly the history of this idea in Indian thought before and after the Upaniṣads.

Let us turn first to the Atharva Veda. It is, as every one knows, a collection of incantations, designed to accompany magic rites for the attainment of almost every conceivable human desire and aspiration. Now it is a commonplace of Atharvan psychology that *knowledge* of the end to be gained is a prime means of gaining it. "We know thy name, O assembly!" says the author of AV. 7. 12. 2, in a charm to get control of the public assembly or town-meeting. "I have grasped the names of all of them," says a medical charm, 6. 63. 2, of the scrofulous sores (*apacit*) which it is striving to overcome. And so on; similar expressions are numerous and are perfectly familiar to all readers of the Atharva Veda. The "name," I may say in passing, is to Vedic India, as to early human psychology the world over, the essence of the person or thing; so in our oldest Upaniṣad, BrhU. 3. 2. 11, the "name" is that eternal part of man which does not perish at death. He who *knows* the name of anything therefore *knows* the essential thing itself; and, in Atharvan conceptions, if he knows it he controls it and can mold it to his purposes, magically, by immediate power of that knowledge. No more fundamental or commonplace idea can be found in the whole range of Atharvan magic.

But it is not limited to that sphere. We meet it again, clearly and insistently set forth in innumerable expressions, in the ritualistic texts of the Brāhmaṇas, which are to the Vedic hymns approximately what the Talmud is to the Jewish scriptures. No better authority on the Brāhmaṇas has ever lived than the late Hermann Oldenberg, who has made this point abundantly clear in his masterly treatise called *Vorwissenschaftliche Wissenschaft, die Weltanschauung der Brāhmaṇa-Texte* (Göttingen, 1919). Of their view of the ritual he says (p. 5): "The *knowledge* of a procedure,² its psychic image, is magically connected with the procedure itself.

² The word used is *Vorgang*, and, as applied to the Brāhmaṇas, means of course primarily a religious rite, since it is with such *Vorgänge* that they mainly deal. But the statement is equally true of any act or entity, and this was clearly in Oldenberg's mind; hence his carefully generalized expression.

The knower, precisely thru the fact that he *knows*—not because thru his knowledge he *acts* skillfully and correctly,³ but by reason of the power of the knowledge in itself . . .—possesses power over the entity or event known.” It is, therefore, even said to be unnecessary actually to perform a rite. If you know it, you have as good as performed it; that is, you can be sure of the benefits which are promised to the performer; and furthermore, ignorant performance, that is mechanically going thru the motions without real knowledge of their esoteric meaning, does not bring the desired result.⁴ Knowledge, not physical action, is the important, the all-important thing. That is why the whole enormous bulk of the Brāhmaṇa texts is devoted to explaining the mystic, esoteric, or magic meaning of the various elements of the ritual. We constantly find in them, after such an explanation, the added statement that he who “knowing thus” (*evam vidvān*) performs the rite, gets such and such a benefit; or, more directly and simply, that he “who knows thus” (*ya evam veda*) gets the benefit. That this doctrine in its extreme form is dangerous to the perpetuation of the actual performances, is obvious. All the more impressive is the fact that despite their absorbing interest in the rites, the Brāhmaṇa texts frequently do not shrink from drawing this conclusion.

In particular this belief in what I shall call, for short, the “magic” power of knowledge manifests itself in the Brāhmaṇas in their passion for *identification* of one thing with another, on the slenderest possible basis; indeed, often on no basis at all that we can discover. These identifications have struck every reader of the Brāhmaṇa texts. Their rationale has never been more clearly or correctly stated than by Oldenberg.⁵ As he says, the purpose is to “set in motion” the cosmic forces dealt with, and to “get from them the desired results.” To this end it is said that they “are” this or that other thing, which other thing we can control. “The Maruts are water. Viṣṇu is the sacrifice. The cow is breath.” As Oldenberg remarks, “By grasping or controlling one of the two identified entities, the possessor of the mystic knowledge as to their identity has power over the other, which is in fact no other (but

³ Note this point; it is a highly important one.

⁴ Oldenberg, *op. cit.*, 140, 201; *Lehre der Upanishaden und Anfänge des Buddhismus*, 2d ed., p. 29.

⁵ *Vorw. Wiss.*, p. 110 f.

really the same) ;” that is, for instance, since “the cow is breath,” and I control a cow, therefore I control breath, my own life-breath, or some one else’s. That is the only reason for the fantastic identification. We want to control breath; so we earnestly and insistently identify it with something that we *can* control, and the trick is turned.⁶

Now the question will arise, what has all this to do with philosophy? Are not the Upaniṣads, the “New Testament” of the Veda as they have been called, occupied with a wholly different order of ideas from those of the magicians of the Atharva Veda, and the ritualists of the Brāhmaṇas? So it has been generally supposed. Some have even gone so far as to hold that the Upaniṣads originated in a different social order; the Vedic priests, it has been thought, could not have conceived the Upaniṣadic ideas, which move on another intellectual plane. Most scholars have not gone to this extreme; they admit the growth of Upaniṣad thought in priestly circles, but think of it as the product of a small group of intelligentia among the brahmans. It is, to be sure, generally granted that the Upaniṣads contain traces of ritualism; occasionally even evidences of magic are recognized in them. But these, when noted at all, are regarded as intrusions, as foreign elements which are mixed with their philosophy but have no proper connexion with it. Conversely, the adumbrations of Upaniṣad philosophy which are occasionally met with in the Vedic hymns and in the Brāhmaṇas are held to belong to a different intellectual sphere from the great

* Oldenberg adds, very acutely, that we find clear traces of this sort of identification even in the hymns of the Rigveda, and cites instances. There is indeed no reason whatever to doubt that this concept was as familiar to the authors of the Rigvedic hymns as to the Atharvan charm-mongers and the Brāhmaṇa theologians. The reason why it does not appear there so clearly is simply that the highly specialized purpose of most of the Rigvedic hymns gives little chance for its expression. The Rigveda is, broadly speaking, simply a hymn-book containing chants to be used in the hieratic ritual, address to the gods of that ritual. Since all the rest of the Veda abounds in evidence of implicit belief in the magic power of knowledge, we should be justified in assuming that the Rigvedic poets also held it, even if it were not expressed there at all; they would not have been Vedic Hindus if they had not held it. But, in fact, we find indications of it even in the Rigveda, quite as often as we should expect, considering the limitations of its practical purpose. This is to be borne in mind in connexion with the philosophic hymns of the Rigveda; see below.

mass of those earlier texts. In short, it is customary to make a sharp division between Vedic ritualism and Vedic magic, on the one hand, and Vedic (or Upaniṣadic) philosophy on the other; and even those who recognize the occurrence of both side by side in the same texts think of this juxtaposition as a mixture of basically unrelated things. The same Oldenberg whose clear characterization of the Brāhmaṇas I have quoted finds a completely different spirit in the Upaniṣads, whose authors in his opinion are true philosophers, seeking the truth about the universe for the pure joy of knowledge in itself, not for the sake of using that knowledge for practical ends. They constitute for that reason, to his mind, a "genuine novelty," altho of course he recognizes traces of their ideas in the earlier literature.⁷

For years the conviction has been growing upon me, as a result of repeated study of early Indian philosophic texts, that this interpretation involves a radical misunderstanding of the point of view of those texts, and indeed of all classical Indian philosophy. It commits the very natural but unfortunate error of attributing to Indian thought the objects which we associate with "philosophy" in the west, at least at the present day, but which have never been associated with it in India, until the most modern times. To our minds, I take it, "philosophy" implies a search for abstract truth about the nature of the universe and man's place in it, as an end in itself. We do not expect a philosopher to do anything with this truth, if and when he gets it, except to enjoy the intellectual pleasure of cognizing it, and to share it with others. If practical motives are concerned, we say it is no longer "pure" philosophy, but religion or something else. But to the Hindus, even of later classical times, and *a fortiori* of the Vedic age, such a conception never occurred; and if it had been suggested to them, they would have regarded it as fantastic and absurd. Oldenberg's figure of a Vedic philosopher seeking "to unfold a picture of things as they are for its own sake, out of the pure joy of perceiving and under-

⁷ See his *Vorw. Wiss.*, p. 3 ff., 7 f. Winternitz (*Gesch. d. ind. Lit.*, I, *passim*, notably p. 203) also separates the streams of ritualistic magic and "true" philosophy; the latter in his opinion originated in non-Brahman circles, tho he makes it clear that both streams are found both in the Upaniṣads (pp. 206-209) and in the philosophic hymns of the Atharva Veda (p. 131).

standing ”⁸ is more than “rare,” as he calls it. Such an individual never existed at all, either in the Vedic period, of which he is speaking, or in later India, as far as our records show. The picture is utterly un-Indian.

Abstract truth for its own sake, as an end in itself, has never for a moment been conceived by Indian philosophers as a proper objective of their speculations. Their intellectual quests have always been associated in their minds with practical ends. The later systems of philosophy are all supposed to be practical means of attaining salvation, *mukti* or *mokṣa*. That is their one and only justification for existence. Typical are the two most famous of the later systems, the Vedānta and the Sāṅkhya. In both, as is well known, human salvation is the sole object of their speculations; and in both alike it is to be gained by knowledge. He who has true knowledge is saved, directly and immediately, and precisely by virtue of that knowledge. They differ as to what true knowledge is, but agree to this extent, that it is knowledge of the real nature of the soul and its position in the universe, its relation to the rest of the universe and its guiding principle. Such knowledge gives its possessor control over his soul’s destiny, that is, salvation.

Now salvation, literally “release” (*mukti*, *mokṣa*), is understood in later India as meaning “release” from the cycle of rebirths, determined by *karma*; that is from the *saṃsāra*, with all the evil and pain inevitably connected therewith.⁹ In the early Upaniṣads this conception of the round of existences, the *saṃsāra*, had not yet fully developed. We see it in process of developing in them. But the word and concept of *mukti* are found there, with the same general connotations as in later times, subject to the qualification just indicated. That is, *mukti* means “release” from the evils of ordinary human existence. In Bṛhad Āraṇyaka Upaniṣad 3.1 are listed four *muktis*: the first, release from death; the second and third, from “day and night” and from “the waxing and waning moon” (that is, from the ravages of time); and the last is ascent to the “heavenly world” (*svarga loka*). And, most characteristically, these “releases” are magically gained by *knowledge* of certain thoroly ritualistic identifications, of elements of the sacrifice with cosmic and human powers, quite in the style of the Brāhmaṇas.

⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 3.

⁹ So first in Śvet. U. 6. 16, *saṃsāramokṣasthitibandhahetuḥ*.

Thus, by the identification of the *hotar*-priest with fire, as a cosmic power, and with speech, as a human faculty, one wins release from death. This ritual-magic wisdom is put into the mouth of no less a personage than Yājñavalkya, the most celebrated of all Upaniṣadic teachers, at the beginning of his contest in learning with the other brahmins at the court of King Janaka, which is one of the high points of Upaniṣad philosophy.

Along with "releases" from evils, the Upaniṣads speak of "attainments" of desiderata. The very same passage just quoted, after disposing of the "releases beyond (evils)," proceeds to describe "attainments" thru ritual-magic knowledge.¹⁰ The "attainments" here are certain natural and supernatural "worlds" (*loka*) which are gained by ritual knowledge. Many of the later systems also promise to the adept not only the supreme goal of salvation, but various incidental benefits which he is to enjoy while progressing towards that goal. I am thinking primarily of the magic powers, (*mahā*-)*siddhis*, promised by the Yoga and other later systems to the philosophic adept. They are secondary and incidental to the main aim, but none the less real.

Nothing seems more natural to the Hindu of ancient times, as indeed to the popular mind in medieval Europe,¹¹ than that very practical and worldly benefits, of many sorts, should ensue magically from superior knowledge. The word *vidyā*, "knowledge," means in classical Sanskrit also "magic" out and out, as all Sanskritists know well. Again and again thruout the Upaniṣads, just as thruout the Brāhmaṇas, we meet the phrase "he who knows thus," *ya evaṁ veda* (or *vidvān*). The same phrase is equally familiar in the Atharva Veda, especially in its philosophic hymns. And everywhere it almost always follows the promise of some extremely practical reward for him who "has such knowledge." Not only long life and release from death, or from that "second death" (*punar-mṛtyu*) beyond the first grave which is such a bugbear to the Vedic Hindus in the birth-throes of the doctrine of transmigration; not only the winning of various heavens; but wealth is this life, worldly success of all kinds, ascendancy over one's fellows, the discomfiture of one's enemies, even success in love—all these and other worldly benefits are among the things to

¹⁰ *ity atimokṣāḥ, atha sūpādaḥ*, BṛhU. 3. 1. 8.

¹¹ See the Epilog to this paper, below.

be gained by the practice of Upaniṣadic speculation, as they were to be gained from the ritualistic and theological speculations of the Brāhmaṇas and from the magic practices of the Atharva Veda. The passages are so numerous that it is hard to see how their significance can have been so generally overlooked. It ought not to be necessary to quote any of them. The list of references in the footnote will be sufficient to show how they permeate the two oldest Upaniṣads, the Bṛhad Āraṇyaka and Chāndogya.¹²

In my article on "The Philosophical Materials of the Atharva Veda" ¹³ I pointed out that in seeking practical benefits thru the magic power of knowledge the Upaniṣads touch upon the special sphere of the Atharva Veda. Its aims are identical with theirs,

¹² BṛhU. 1. 2. 1, 3, 5, 7-8 (to be understood together as meaning that he who knows the identity of the *arka*-fire and the *aśvamedha*-sacrifice with Death "wards off death, death does not attain him"); 1. 3. 7, 9, 16, 18, 25, 26, 28 (Mādhy. 1. 3. 8, 10, 17, 19, 27, 28, 33); 1. 4. 1, 6, 7, 10, 15, 16, 17 (Mādhy. 1. 4. 2, 10, 14, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31); 1. 5. 1, 2, 12, 15, 16, 20 (Mādhy. 1. 5. 1, 6, 19, 23, 24, 29); 2. 1. 2 ff. (a long series of philosophic doctrines which are all declared to be partial or incomplete; nevertheless each brings its possessor its appropriate benefit; e. g. in 5 it is proposed by Gārgya to consider the *puruṣa* in the *ākāśa* as Brahman, to which Ajātaśatru replies: 'Speak not of him to me; I revere him as the full and non-departing; who so reveres him is filled with offspring and cattle, and his offspring do not depart from this world!'); 2. 2. 1, 2, 4 (M. 6); 2. 3. 6 (M. 10); 3. 3. 2; 3. 9. 28 (M. 34); 4. 1. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 (M. 4. 1. 4, 7, 10, 13, 16, 19); 4. 2. 4 (M. 6); 4. 3. 37 (M. 43); 4. 4. 8, 12, 14, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 (M. 11, 15, 16, 21, 22, 23, 27, 28, 29, 31); 4. 5. 4, cf. 15 (M. 4. 5. 4 and 25; immortality to be gained from the knowledge set forth in this chapter); 5. 1; 5. 3 (M. 4); 5. 4 (M. 5); 5. 5. 1, 3, 4 (M. 5. 6. 2, 4, 5); 5. 7; M. 5. 8 (= K. 5. 6, which omits *ya evaṃ veda*); 5. 11; 5. 12 (M. 5. 13. 3); 5. 13. 1-4 (M. 5. 14. 1-4); 5. 14. 1-8 (M. 5. 15. 1-12); 6. 1. 1-6 (M. 6. 2. 1-6); 6. 2. 15, 16 (M. 6. 1. 18, 19);—ChU. 1. 1. 7, 8, 10; 1. 2. 8, 14; 1. 3. 1, 7; 1. 4. 5; 1. 6. 7; 1. 7. 7, 8; 1. 9. 2; 1. 13. 4; 2. 1. 4; 2. 2. 3; 2. 3. 2; 2. 4. 2; 2. 5. 2; 2. 6. 2; 2. 7. 2; 2. 8. 3; 2. 10. 6; 2. 11. 2; 2. 12. 2; 2. 13. 2; 2. 14. 2; 2. 15. 2; 2. 16. 2; 2. 17. 2; 2. 18. 2; 2. 19. 2; 2. 20. 2; 2. 21. 2; 3. 6. 3-4; 3. 7. 3-4; 3. 8. 3-4; 3. 9. 3-4; 3. 10. 3-4; 3. 12. 7; 3. 13. 1-7; 3. 15. 2; 3. 16. 7; 3. 18. 6; 3. 19. 4; 4. 3. 8; 4. 5. 3; 4. 6. 4; 4. 7. 4; 4. 8. 4; 4. 11. 2; 4. 12. 2; 4. 13. 2; 4. 14. 3; 4. 15. 2, 3, 4; 4. 17. 8-9; 5. 1. 1-5; 5. 2. 1; 5. 10. 10; 5. 18. 1; 5. 24. 2; 7. 1. 5; 7. 2. 2; 7. 3. 2; 7. 4. 3; 7. 5. 3; 7. 6. 2; 7. 7. 2; 7. 8. 2; 7. 9. 2 etc. (this series is similar in spirit to BṛhU. 2. 1. 2 ff., see above); 7. 25 and 26 (climax to the preceding; perfect knowledge brings unlimited powers); 8. 1. 6 with 8. 2. 1-10; 8. 3. 5; 8. 7. 1; 8. 12. 6.

¹³ *Studies in Honor of Maurice Bloomfield*, pp. 117-135; see especially p. 133.

and one of its familiar methods of attaining those aims is thru that same power of knowledge, as set forth above. And, in fact, the Atharva Veda is the special home of early Vedic speculation. This fact is obvious and undisputed; the Atharva Veda, this book of spells and incantations, contains far more philosophic materials than the Rigveda or any other Vedic Saṁhitā. Every one has always observed this circumstance, and found it surprising—indeed, inexplicable. It is inexplicable from any other point of view than that which I am here proposing, and which I first proposed in the article cited. Those who think of Vedic speculation as the work of abstract, disinterested “philosophers” in our western sense, can only regard the inclusion of so much of their work in a book of magic charms as a strange anomaly. But the Atharvan philosophic materials themselves, to a very large extent, and still more the manner in which they are used in the Kauśika Sūtra and the other ritual handbooks of the Atharva Veda, indicate clearly the practical, magical ends which their esoteric knowledge was designed to gain. And so they themselves furnish the reason for their inclusion in the Atharva Veda, to which they are perfectly appropriate.

Typical is the hymn AV. 11. 4. Its subject is the *prāṇa*, the cosmic “breath,” that is the wind, most strikingly manifested in the storm-wind; hence the obvious naturalistic allusions to storms which the hymn contains. This breath of the universe is, quite naturally and yet acutely, made the enlivening principle of the cosmos. The author is thoroly at home in the phraseology and ideology of Vedic higher thought, and applies it to his subject with a freshness and vigor which suggest an unusual amount of intellectual acumen. He is certainly no mere ignorant witch-doctor. Yet that does not mean that he is free from natural human desires. Not only the last stanza,¹⁴ but several stanzas scattered thruout the hymn, give expression to the active desire that the cosmic “breath” shall confer boons on him who knows and glorifies it, particularly, of course, by means of its counterpart, the individual “breath” or “life” in the human being. So Kauśika very appro-

¹⁴ Cf. Bloomfield, *Hymns of the Atharva Veda*, p. 623; Oldenberg, *Vorw. Wiss.*, p. 6, note. These authors overlook the similar passages in stanzas 9, 11, 18, 19 of the hymn, and speak as if the last stanza were the only one that shows traces of magic ends.

propiately uses the hymn in magic performances for long life. In so doing Kauśika does no violence to the thought of the hymn; on the contrary, this was quite clearly the intent of its author. His thought is thoroly Upaniṣadic, quite as lofty as the average of Upaniṣad speculations; and an Upaniṣad author would typically conclude such a passage with an expression like this: "Long life he attains, the breath of life (*prāṇa*) does not leave him, who knows thus (*ya evaṃ veda*)!"

There is here no question of a secondary fusion of unrelated activities, philosophy and magic. On the contrary, all Vedic philosophy may (from our point of view) be described as a sort of philosophic magic, or magical philosophy.¹⁵ That is precisely why

¹⁵ As set forth in these words in my article, *op. cit.*, p. 134. I must refer to this place, especially p. 121 ff., for further details as to the evidence for the magical intent of Atharvan philosophy. (A limited number of reprints of this article are available for free distribution, on application to the author.) I am pleased to note that the views there advanced have been noticed favorably by such good scholars as Winternitz (*OLZ.* 1924, p. 424) and Keith (*Religion and Philosophy of the Veda*, p. 510, n. 3). To be sure I must add with regret that I have failed to find in Keith's book much evidence that he has been influenced by my arguments. Winternitz points out that he exprest long ago views similar to some of mine; I hope I am not wrong in understanding that he would now agree even more closely with me; cf. note 7 above.—I would add here that the case for the practical application of AV. philosophic hymns is really stronger than appears from my former article. While the Atharvan ritual texts fail in some cases to record the uses to which they are put (*loc. cit.*, p. 119), the hymns themselves do so more regularly than I there indicated. Thus I observed that AV. 8. 10 is ignored in all the ritual texts; but I should have added that the hymn itself emphatically states (vss 2-7, 17-29, 33) the practical benefits to be won by him who "knows" (*ya evaṃ veda*) its mysteries, quite in Upaniṣad fashion. So also the recurring refrain of AV. 11. 3. 32-49; and for other similar references see AV. 4. 1. 7; 9. 10. 24; 10. 2. 29, 30; 10. 7. 40, 41; 10. 8. 22, 43, 44; 11. 3. 51; 11. 5. 10, 25. With so much *primary* evidence, in the hymns themselves, the partial lack of *secondary* evidence of magical employment in the ritual handbooks is not important. I should further have noted the fact that even the famous Rīgvedic Hiraṇyagarbha hymn, RV. 10. 121, ends with the definite statement that it was designed to win practical desiderata. It is true that this tenth verse is perhaps a later addition to the hymn. But even vs 9, unquestionably part of the original text, prays "May He (the One) harm us not." And the Viśvakarman hymn, RV. 10. 81, is as definitely practical in its aim as any Atharvan incantation (vss 6, 7). Whether thus stated in terms or not, *all* Vedic philosophy has practical aims.

it belongs primarily to the Atharva Veda. The fact that the Rigveda also contains a few hymns of this sort is exactly analogous to its inclusion of some magic spells, also. Both are equally "Atharvanic" and equally foreign to the primary purpose of the Rigveda, which is a hymn-book for use at the hieratic ritual services. The rare and scattering philosophic materials of the Rigveda are all found in the tenth or first books (mainly in the tenth), which are recognized as late additions to the collection, and which also contain most of the other "Atharvanic" materials, the incantations, wedding and funeral hymns, etc.¹⁶ Not that the "magic" power of knowledge was unknown to the Rigvedic poets.¹⁷ Of course this belief was common to the age as a whole. But, equally of course, no one, or at least few, relied upon it exclusively for protection. Even the Atharvanists engaged in magical *performances*; with all their faith in the power of knowledge in itself, they reinforced that knowledge by active measures. The theory behind most of the Rigveda is, as is well known, that human desires will be granted by the gods, when they have been propitiated by the ritual of sacrifice and praise. Cross-bred with the theory that magic rites, performed with true esoteric knowledge, must bring the desired results of themselves, this ritualistic theory gave birth in Brāhmaṇa times to the belief that the gods are negligible intermediaries, or even play no part at all in the process; a rite, performed with proper knowledge, must of itself result in the benefit that is sought. Or, even more drastically, the actual performance of the rite is unnecessary; if one knows its true nature, by virtue of that knowledge he controls the desired result, and need not actually *do* anything. Here is, if you like, a true "blend"; but not a blend between magic and philosophy. Rather, a blend between ritual religion on the one hand and magical philosophy or

¹⁶ It is not an argument against this view that the text-tradition of the Rigvedic philosophic hymns is better than that of the corresponding Atharvan ones, as I showed, *loc. cit.*, p. 123 ff. The same is true of the entire Rigvedic tradition. It is simply due to the fact that the Rigvedic schools were better educated. The Atharvanists were not the scholars that the Rigvedic poets were. Even the magic charms, which strayed into the collection of the Rigveda, are generally found there in a more intelligent form than the corresponding ones of the Atharva Veda. No one would argue from this that the Rigveda, rather than the Atharva, is their original home.

¹⁷ Cf. above, note 6; and further see RV. 1. 164. 16, 39.

philosophic magic on the other. And in this blend, ritualistic religion is the moribund element. Magical philosophy constantly tends to get the upper hand. We are drifting into the intellectual sphere of the Upaniṣads.

For few would now dispute that the Brāhmaṇas are the womb of Upaniṣad thought. They are far more intimately related to the Upaniṣads than to the R̥gveda, precisely because of their emphasis on the importance of knowledge, of a true understanding of the esoteric meaning of things. Their hair-splitting theological disquisitions give birth to the cosmic and metaphysical (but at the same time largely ritualistic) speculations of the Upaniṣads. And just as the Upaniṣads contain many external and internal indications of their intimate connexion with the Brāhmaṇas (the oldest of them, the Br̥had Āraṇyaka, is part of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa; and large parts of them deal wholly with ritualistic entities and concepts)—so they never lose sight for long of the practical ends which they also inherit from the Brāhmaṇas, and which like them they conceive to depend upon true, esoteric, or mystic knowledge of the entities with which they deal. These ends and this method of gaining them are inherited by the Brāhmaṇas directly from the intellectual sphere which we call Atharvanic, and are then passed on to the Upaniṣads.

If there is any general difference in spirit between the Brāhmaṇas and the Upaniṣads, it lies in just this, that the Upaniṣads carry out fully, to its logical extreme, the Atharvan-Brāhmaṇa doctrine that esoteric knowledge is the only thing that counts in the last analysis; that it is the supreme method of gaining all one's desires. The Atharvanists and the Brāhmaṇa-authors may tell us that knowledge is all that is necessary; but with natural and pardonable inconsistency, they still continue to act, to perform ritual and magic practices, as if they believed in the efficacy of actions. The Upaniṣads attach little or no importance to action, ritual or other. Far more consistently than the Brāhmaṇas (tho even they, as we saw, occasionally go as far as this), they take the position that if one knows the mystic meaning of a performance, he need not actually carry it out in order to get the benefit of its fruits. They constantly sing the same song: "he who knows" this or that, gets his desire fulfilled. To be sure, by reading chiefly between the lines, we may find evidence that ritual and magical acts were still performed. But little importance is attached to the actual

performance. For instance, several passages tell us that ritual acts, if performed without knowledge of their esoteric meaning, are not only useless,¹⁸ but dangerous; the presumptuous performer is likely to have his head burst asunder.¹⁹ Again, "he who knows" a particular rite, of which the mystic meaning has just been explained, "and he who knows it not, both perform it; but" when performed with knowledge it becomes more effective.²⁰ The world of men is attained by begetting a son, the world of the manes by sacrifice, the world of the gods by knowledge; but the world of the gods is the best of worlds, therefore "knowledge is best."²¹ People say that by offering with milk for a year one escapes re-death (*punar-mṛtyu*); but this is an error; on the very (first) day on which *one who knows* makes such an offering, on that very day he escapes re-death.²² And even such qualified tributes to the power of actions as these are rare in the Upaniṣads. Generally it is knowledge, knowledge alone and of itself, which brings the desired end, no other method being recognized as even possible. "He who knows" gets anything he wants, by the direct and magical power of his knowledge.²³

¹⁸ ChU. 5. 24. 1.

¹⁹ ChU. 1. 8 and 1. 10-11.

²⁰ ChU. 1. 1. 10.

²¹ BrhU. 1. 5. 16 (Mādhyamīna rec. 24).

²² BrhU. 1. 5. 2 (Mādhy. 6). We also find clear evidence that what we should call purely magic practices were carried on in these same "philosophical" circles; thus additional proof is furnished for the intimate connexion between the spheres of the Atharva Veda and the Upaniṣads. BrhU. 6. 3 and 4 deal with such practices in a thoroughly Atharvan manner. They include even love-charms, charms to compel a woman to yield her love, birth-control charms to prevent conception, and conversely charms to bring about conception when it is desired; parturition charms, etc., etc. But the knowledge motif is dominant throughout. Thus, at the very outset, the sexual act is explained mystically as a kind of ritual performance, the elements of which are identified, Brāhmaṇa-wise, with the parts of the woman's body; and then we are told that if a man practises sexual intercourse knowing this, he gains a world as great as he who sacrifices with the Vājapeya-rite, and takes to himself the merit of women; but if he practises it without knowing this, women take to themselves his merit (BrhU. 6. 4. 3).

²³ Some later religious and philosophic texts are more catholic, and recognize other ways of gaining salvation, altho "knowledge" remained perhaps the favorite on the whole; at any rate, the late Sāṅkhya and Vedānta systems clung to it exclusively. In the philosophy of the epic, on the other

An important further question now arises. Is any relation discernible between the kind of knowledge sought, at a given point, and the nature of the practical benefit to be derived from it?

In some cases it is hard for us to discern any reason for the association of a particular boon with a particular quantum of esoteric knowledge. In an Atharvan hymn (13.3) the sun is glorified as the cosmic First Principle; and, in the constantly recurring refrain of each verse, this "ruddy one" (Rohita) is invoked to destroy any enemy of the wise man "who knows thus." The idea seems to be simply that one who is fortified with such mystic knowledge must be safe from attack by human foes. But any other desideratum would seem to us equally appropriate. Similarly in the Upaniṣad passage last quoted (BrhU. 1. 5. 2) we saw that escape from re-death is promised to one who performs with esoteric knowledge a certain milk-offering for a single day.

hand, various courses of *action* are recognized as possible roads to salvation, as alternatives to the way of knowledge. These active methods are called Yoga, "activity" (see *American Journal of Philology*, 45. 37 ff. for a brief account of them), and are distinguished as such from the method of knowledge, known as Sāṅkhya, "reckoning, reasoning, ratiocination". In the epic and in all earlier Sanskrit literature the terms Sāṅkhya and Yoga do not refer to metaphysical systems, but to ways of gaining salvation; see my article, "The Meaning of Sāṅkhya and Yoga," *Am. Jour. Phil.*, 45. 1-46. For the relation of this early meaning of the word Sāṅkhya to the later "Sāṅkhya" system, see *ibid.*, 32 ff.; and for yet other ways of salvation than "knowledge" and "action", p. 46.—Keith, *Religion and Philosophy of the Veda*, 2, p. 543 f., rejects the conclusions of this article, but adduces little reason for doing so; his remarks amount to hardly more than a dogmatic refusal to accept what I still think I showed to be the plain and unmistakable evidence of the texts themselves as to the meaning of the two words. As an example of the cogency of such arguments as Keith offers, I may mention his treatment of Mbh. 12. 13713 ff. (p. 543, *infra*). Here he says: "In this passage we find two very distinct views set out: the Sāṅkhya and the Yoga accept a multiplicity of souls, while Vyāsa insists that all the souls at bottom rest on the world soul." But, as I pointed out (p. 28), this doctrine of Vyāsa "that all the souls at bottom rest on the world soul" is definitely stated in vs 13763 to be "Sāṅkhya and Yoga"! What becomes of the distinction on which Keith lays such great weight? One "distinct view" is as much Sāṅkhya and Yoga as the other, according to the text. Is the text mere gibberish—or is Keith wrong? I prefer to assume that the text knows what it is talking about. (In actual fact the text does not intend to make the distinction between the two "views" which Keith supposes, as I clearly showed.)

Why precisely release from re-death, rather than any other boon? The only answer (if it be considered an answer) probably is that ritualistic tradition made this particular association.

This condition is, however, just what we should expect, after all. It is what we very commonly find in connexion with Atharvan magic rites and with the ritual performances of the Brāhmaṇas. Often we can discern no special reason for the clearly exprest expectation of a certain result from a particular rite or incantation.

On the other hand, it would be an error to think of such cases as typical of philosophic magic in general. Much more often we can see very definite reasons for the association. If the *prāṇa*-hymn which we discuss above²⁴ is used to attain long life, this is obviously because knowledge of the universal *prāṇa*, the life-breath of the cosmos, may naturally be expected to give the knower control over that "life-breath," and hence over its manifestation in himself, namely, his own "life-breath." Just so, times without number, in the Upaniṣads the name of the thing or concept known suggests the boon to be derived from the knowledge. Scores of examples could be quoted; they occur on almost every page. It will suffice to refer to Brhad Āraṇyaka Upaniṣad 2. 1, where e. g. in paragraphs 4 to 6 he who knows the "glorious" gets "glorious" offspring; he who knows the "full and undeparting" is "filled" with offspring and cattle, and his offspring "do not depart" from this world (*sc.* before him); he who knows the "unconquerable" becomes himself "unconquerable." Sometimes the identification is made only by what we should call verbal distortions or bad puns; but to the authors these are just as serious as what we might term sound "philological" identifications.

So far we have dealt with knowledge of special, limited subjects. It results, we have seen, in particular boons for the possessor, boons which are generally appropriate to the name or nature of the thing known. The essential idea is that "he who knows" any one thing, gets that thing, or something corresponding to it. But from this it is only a short step to the logical conclusion that if one could only know everything, he would thereby get—everything. Universal knowledge, omniscience, must be a short-cut to omnipotence, to the power of satisfying any desire. If what you know you con-

²⁴ AV. 11. 4; see page 105.

trol, then by knowing the all, you can control the all. If, then, a formula can be discovered which will provide you with the fundamental truth of all that is, the knowledge of that formula will make you master of the universe. And specifically, in true Brāhmaṇa spirit, that formula is to be sought in a mystic identification. You must discover something which "is" the essence of the all: especially, if possible, something which you can control, so that thereby you can control everything.²⁵

This is the secret of the famous "quest of the Upaniṣads" after a formulaic identification of something or other with the First Principle of the universe. The regular answer to the question: "With what shall we identify the one thing, by knowing which all is known?" is "with the soul, *ātman*, of man." Obviously: for the One, whether it be called Brahman,²⁶ or the Existent (*sat*), the Real, or what-not, is naturally the essential self or "soul" (*ātman*) of the universe. If it is *ātman*, and my soul, my real self, is also *ātman*, then is not the mystic identification ready-made? Just as the "life-breath" of the universe is the same as the "life-breath" of man, and by "knowing" the one you control the other.²⁷ And surely there is nothing which I control more perfectly than my own "self." If then I "know" that the Brahman, which is the *ātman* of the universe, is my own *ātman*, then not only do I control the fundamental principle of the universe, because knowledge is magic power; but even more than that, I *am* the fundamental principle of the universe, by that mystic identification. For this double reason, there is nothing out of my control or beyond my grasp.

The *knowledge* of the One which is All, and its identification with the human soul, is then a short-cut to the satisfaction of all desires, the freedom from all fear and danger and sorrow. Just as knowledge of individual or partial truths gives to its possessor the individual and special boons appropriate to each partial truth, as in the passage quoted above, so knowledge that the one true

²⁵ Altho the mere knowledge of a thing is enuf to give you control over it, there is clearly a feeling that you strengthen your hold on it if you can identify it mystically with something over which you have more obvious power. This is exactly the notion underlying the identifications of the Brāhmaṇas; see p. 99 above.

²⁶ As so why it is so regularly called that, see below 116 f.

²⁷ AV. 11. 4; above, p. 105.

essence of everything is my soul gives me control over everything.²⁸ When and because I *know* that, I am identical with the One, which in the very nature of the case cannot be affected by any unsatisfied

²⁸ The passage in BrhU. 2. 1, referred to above, p. 111, is very significant. In its famous conversation between Gārgya and Ajātaśatru, Gārgya proposes twelve different entities, one after another, as expressions for the Brahman, the cosmic One. Ajātaśatru denies that each in turn is the Brahman, but explains what it really is, and assigns a particular boon to the possessor of this knowledge. He then proceeds to give his own view of what the Brahman is in very truth; namely, it is to be identified with the spirit or soul (*ātman*) in man, which in sound sleep is actually united with the cosmic soul or Brahman, and which is "the real of the real." No statement is here found of the profit ensuing to one "who knows thus." But is it conceivable that *perfect* knowledge should have *no* practical reward, when imperfect and partial bits of knowledge have just been asserted to have each their appropriate rewards? It seems clear that the omission is only due to the author's considering it so obvious as to need no statement. And this is confirmed by the occurrence elsewhere of the missing statement of the practical rewards for this knowledge. For the same doctrine is found in a much fuller and more perfect form in BrhU. 4. 3 and 4. In 4.3. 19 ff. we find the closest possible parallel to the latter part of 2. 1, with its identification of the soul, particularly in its state of deep sleep, with the One. This is the soul's true form, in which all his desires are satisfied, in which he is *without desire and without sorrow* (21). And why is he so? Just because the soul is one with the One which is All, and therefore his senses cannot operate on anything, for there is no object on which they might operate—nothing outside of himself (23-31); this is his highest goal, the highest bliss, the *summum bonum* (32). To be sure, this state is attained permanently only after death, and then only by the soul "who has no desire" (4. 4. 6 = Mādhy. 8). But who is this soul that "has no desire"? None other than he who *knows* the soul—knows, that is, the esoteric truth, that his own soul is one with the universal soul or Brahman. This is emphatically stated, over and over again, in the conclusion of this passage; note particularly 4. 4. 12 = Mādhy. 16, "If a person understands the soul (*ātman*), knowing 'I am He,' then desiring what, for the love of what, could he cling to the body?"—13 = M. 17: "Who has found out and become awakened to this soul . . . he is the All-creator, for he creates everything; the world (or, heaven) in his; nay, he is the world (or, heaven) himself." That is, when he knows the world-soul as himself, he controls it, which is the soul of everything, and so controls everything; nay rather, he *is* everything. What wonder, then, that he can no longer have any desire? All his desires are thereby fulfilled. The conclusion of this passage, 4. 4. 19-22 = Mādhy. 21-31, is a magnificent paean of triumph celebrating the consummate perfection of bliss of the soul who attains this perfect knowledge. The whole passage deserves to be read

longing or by any evil or sorrow, because there is nothing outside or independent of me for which my senses and mind might long.²⁹

The famous dictum of the identity of the human soul with the world-soul will now appear in a somewhat new light. People never tire of quoting the phrase "I am the Brahman" as a brilliant philosophical *aperçu*. I am not here to deny that it deserves such praise. But I think its real meaning, and the rationale behind it, have never been quite understood. Its context has generally been neglected. The passage³⁰ where it occurs says: "Whoever *knows* that 'I am Brahman,' *becomes* this all"; and later, "from that same self he (who knows this) *creates whatsoever he desires*." That is, the possessor of this mystic knowledge can do whatever he pleases. That is obviously the very practical reason for knowing it. The idea is not so new as it has often been represented as being. It is essentially contained in the magical-philosophic hymns of the Atharva Veda.³¹ It rests on the same basis as the doctrine that "he who knows the unconquerable one becomes unconquerable," and countless similar expressions thruout both the Upanishads and the older Vedic literature. The practical, magical benefits of such mystic knowledge are clearly stated in connexion with almost all similar expressions. The Atharva Veda passage which

in this connexion; I will quote only a few extracts: "Therefore, he who has this knowledge . . . sees only himself (his soul, *ātman*) in the self (the universal soul, *ātman*). He sees everything as the self; (Mādhy. adds, 'every one becomes his self, he becomes the self of every one';) he gets past all evil; evil cannot affect him; free from evil, from impurity (Mādhy., from old age), from doubt (Mādhy., from hunger and thirst), he becomes a *brāhmaṇa* (a veritable possessor of the Brahman), *who knows thus!*" And finally, at the very end: "This is that great unborn soul (*ātman*), free from old age, from death, and from fear (or, danger), immortal—the Brahman. Fearless, verily, is Brahman. HE BECOMES THE FEARLESS BRAHMAN—WHO KNOWS THUS!"

²⁹ Cf. BrhU. 1. 4. 2; 4. 3. 23-31.

³⁰ BrhU. 1. 4. 10, and 15, = Mādhyamīna 22, and 28.

³¹ AV. 10. 7. 41 (originally the concluding verse of the hymn to Skambha as First Principle; so it still is in the Paippalāda, see Whitney's note *ad loc.*) clearly says that "He who knows" the First Principle, "he verily is the mystic Lord of Creatures," that is, he becomes the First Principle. And what he is to gain thereby is stated with equal clarity in AV. 9. 10. 24: "in his (the First Principle's) control are what has been and what is to be. He shall put in my control (because I know him) what has been and what is to be!"

contains the very earliest occurrence of the word *ātman* in its philosophic sense takes pains to make clear the reason for knowing that *ātman*; ³² such a knower is possessed of all the qualities attributed to the soul of the universe. And the like is stated over and over again in the Upaniṣads. ³³

In the light of such passages we can understand better the true meaning of such a passage as the famous sixth chapter of the Chāndogya Upaniṣad. It sets out to find the one thing "by knowing which all is known." ³⁴ It is explained as the "existent" (*sat*); it is in everything, and everything is in the last analysis nothing but that. It is, moreover, mystically identified with the human soul: "what that subtle essence is, a state-of-having-that-as-its-essence is this universe, that is the real, that is the soul, that art thou (*tat tvam asi*)!" ³⁵ There is, to be sure, in this chapter no definite statement of the practical benefit to be gained by this "knowledge." Are we then to suppose that here is an isolated example of a "disinterested" philosopher, seeking nothing but the

³² AV. 10. 8. 44: "The desireless, intelligent, immortal, self-existent, satisfied with contentment ('sap', *rasa*), not lacking in anything—he who knows this Soul, the intelligent, ageless, (ever) young, has no fear of death."

³³ A few examples: BrhU. 1. 5. 20 = Mādhy. 29: "He who *knows* this becomes the Self of all beings. As is that divinity (the One), so is he. As all beings favor that divinity, so all beings favor him who knows this. Whatsoever these creatures suffer, that remains with them alone. Only good reaches him. Evil, verily, does not reach gods." BrhU. 4. 3. 37 = Mādhy. 43: "All beings wait upon him who *knows* this, saying: 'Here comes the Brahman!'" ChU. 7. 25. 2: "He who beholds, thinks on, *knows*, and enjoys only this (self, *ātman*) . . . is independent (self-ruling); he has unlimited freedom in all worlds. While they who know otherwise than this are dependent (ruled by others); their worlds are destructible; they have no freedom in all worlds." ChU. 8. 12. 6: "He obtains all worlds and all desires who *understands* that Self." TU. 2. 1: "He who *knows* Brahman . . . attains all desires." TU. 2. 4: "Who *knows* the bliss of Brahman never fears anything." AU. 5. 4: "So he, having ascended on high from this world with that Self of *knowledge*, obtained all desires in that heavenly world, and became immortal." KauṣU. 1. 7: "Whatever conquest is Brahman's, whatever attainment, even that conquest he conquers, that attainment he attains, who *knows* this." MuṇḍU. 3. 2. 9: "He who *knows* that supreme Brahman becomes Brahman itself. . . . He is beyond sorrow, beyond evil. Freed from the knots of the heart, he becomes immortal."

³⁴ ChU. 6. 1. 3.

³⁵ *Ibid.* 6. 8 ff.

abstract truth for the pure joy of knowing it? Let those believe it who may. For my part, such an opinion would seem to me strangely blind, in view of the overwhelming mass of contrary evidence. No: the philosopher of this passage seeks "knowledge" of the essence of the universe for the same reason that all the men of his time (and even of much later times in India) sought it: because he believes that if he knows that One, and identifies it with his own true self, he can by that knowledge control all cosmic forces, and therefore his own destiny. His "that art thou" is motivated in the same way as the Brhad Āraṇyaka's "I am Brahman." He who *knows* that he is mystically the All, partakes of its essence, is at one with It, and therefore cannot be subject to any outside influence which might cause any fear, danger, sorrow, or unsatisfied desire. That for once the author does not say so in definite terms means only that to him it was a perfectly obvious matter of course.³⁶ It went without saying. It is really surprisingly lucky that practically all other similar passages do take the trouble to state it so definitely.

This belief in the power of knowledge gives us the clue to the employment of the term *brāhman* as a name for the ultimate First Principle, about which there has been such endless discussion. Brahman means simply "holy knowledge", or, concretely, a Vedic hymn or incantation, that is, a concrete expression of this mystic wisdom; the Vedic mind feels no difference between the abstract and the concrete sides of this concept. Moreover, *all* knowledge is, to the Vedic mind, holy, mysterious, religious or magical knowledge. It always possesses this magic power. The wise man and the priest or religious (magical) practitioner (*vipra*, *kārū*, *brahmān* masc., etc.) are completely identical from the Vedic

³⁶ As in BrhU. 2. 1 it is also not stated, but clearly must be understood, for the reasons explained in footnote 28, above. Apart from these two, I can find no other early Upaniṣad statement of this doctrine (the unity of the human soul with the world-principle) which does not make clear the "fruit" or benefit to be derived from knowing it. Certainly the Yājñavalkya dialog, BrhU. 3, is not an exception. It not only indicates at various points in its course (e. g. 3. 1 *passim*, see p. 102 above; 3. 2. 12 = Mādhy. 11; 3. 3. 2; 3. 5 = Mādhy. 4; 3. 8. 10) that knowledge of its mysteries is to bring fruition of desires; but it concludes with the climactic statement that "Understanding, bliss, the Brahman, the highest goal of the giver of bounty, belong to him who stands steadfast in *knowledge* of this" (3. 9. 28 = Mādhy. 34).

standpoint. Since knowledge means absolute, direct power, what is more natural than that the holy, mystic knowledge (*brāhman*) of the universe should be half-personified as the First Principle, the Controller of the universe? He who knows this, knows the essence of the cosmos, and so controls it; in fact, upon the identification of this "soul" of the universe with the "soul" of man, he who has this knowledge is identical with it. It is natural that this Brahman, this holy knowledge of the universe, should appear at times, especially in the earliest texts, in definitely personified forms, as the feminine Vāc, "Holy Utterance," or the masculine Bṛhas-pati, Brahmanas-pati, "the Lord of Holy Wisdom," both of which are well-known as expressions for the First Principle.³⁷ But in the philosophic hymns of the Atharva Veda, and in the similar passages of the Brāhmanas, it is the neuter Brahman itself which more regularly occupies this position, just as it does later in the Upaniṣads, alongside of more abstract expressions like "the Existent" (*sat*, also known to the older texts). Let us remember the important and highly significant fact that in the Atharva Veda the regular meaning of the neuter *brāhman* is "charm, incantation," that is, a hymn of the Atharva Veda itself, as an expression of mystic wisdom. How many times do the magic charms of the Atharva Veda allude to the power inherent in the incantation (*brāhman*) to bring about the desired end, be it release from disease,³⁸ advancement over one's fellows,³⁹ injury to rivals,⁴⁰ or what-not! The very first hymn of the Atharva Veda invokes the Lord of Holy Utterance, Vācas-pati, to abide in the Atharvan practitioner, that is, to endow him with the all-important mystic knowledge which is to enable him to gain any end he pleases. As we pointed out above, and as every Vedist knows, the word and the thing denoted are one to the Vedic mind; he who knows the Holy Word knows the concept behind it, and controls it; speech = knowledge. And it is because of the all-embracing power of knowl-

³⁷ So RV. 10. 125 = AV. 4. 30 is a hymn to Vāc personified as the One; and in RV. 10. 81. 7 the cosmic Viśvakarman, "the All-maker," is the Lord of Vāc, "Holy Utterance;" cf. also RV. 10. 71 for a like treatment of Vāc. For Bṛhas-pati or Brahmanas-pati in the same rôle see RV. 10. 71. 1; 10. 72. 2.

³⁸ E. g. 2. 10. 1.

³⁹ 1. 9. 3.

⁴⁰ 1. 14. 4.

edge that the Brahman, Holy Knowledge, *alias* the power of its concrete expression the magic charm, is already in the Atharva Veda, and remains for all later time, a favorite expression for the supreme power of the universe.

SUMMARY

The Upaniṣads, then, seek to know the real truth about the universe, not for its own sake; not for the mere joy of knowledge; not as an abstract speculation; but simply because they conceive such knowledge as a short-cut to the control of every cosmic power. The possessor of such knowledge will be in a position to satisfy his any desire. He will be free from old age and death, from danger and sorrow, from all the ills that flesh is heir to. By knowledge of the One which is All, and by mystically identifying his own self with that One which is All, he has, like that One, the All in his control. Knowledge, true esoteric knowledge, is the magic key to omnipotence, absolute power. By it one becomes autonomous.⁴¹ From the Upaniṣads this idea was inherited by the later Hindu systems, such as the Vedānta and the epic and classical Sāṅkhya, which regard true knowledge as the key to man's salvation, as giving man *ipso facto* control of his destiny. But it is the earlier, rather than the later, history of the idea which has been our chief concern here. It has been shown that it is identical with the belief in the magic power of knowledge which is such a commonplace in the Brāhmaṇas, and above all in the Atharva Veda. It is of the essence of Atharvan magic practice that by knowledge of any entity it expects to control that entity, directly and magically. Precisely for this reason the Atharva Veda is the particular home of Vedic philosophy, which is simply an attempt to gain at one stroke all possible human ends, by *knowing*, once for all, the essential truth of the entire cosmos. If *all* can be known at once, and especially if it can be mystically identified with one's own "soul," one's very self, then all will be controlled, and there will be no need of half-way measures; no need of attempting by magic to gain this or that special desideratum. That such minor, special desiderata are, in spite of this, frequently sought in the Upaniṣads, just as in the Atharva Veda, and that too generally by means of mystic

⁴¹ *svarāj*, ChU. 7. 25. 2.

knowledge, is natural enuf, and is only an additional confirmation of the fact that the spheres of the Upaniṣads and of the Atharva Veda are identical. Finally, the Brahman, as an expression for the supreme power of the universe, is simply this same magic knowledge; its concrete manifestation is an Atharvan incantation.

EPILOG

It is impossible here to attempt to trace the history of this idea of the magic power of knowledge in countries outside of India. The subject is much too vast. I may, however, point out that, as I have remarked elsewhere,⁴² the same notion prevailed in Europe down to quite modern times. In Robert Greene's play, *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, produced in England at the end of the sixteenth century, we find it in full force. Roger Bacon, the greatest of medieval English scholars, is there represented simply as a mighty magician, and a contest between him and a rival German scholar resolves itself into a mere test of their powers of necromancy. Shakespeare's *Tempest* shows the same thing; Prospero, the scholar, is, as a matter of course, a magician. In short, knowledge meant primarily magic power. The ordinary man could hardly conceive the pursuit of knowledge for any other reason. Roger Bacon himself may perhaps have had a different point of view; tho whether he was completely free from the popular ideas of his time, I doubt. But he was, in any case, an exceptional man, intellectually far in advance of his time.

In India, likewise, the more advanced thinkers gradually freed their speculations from the common aims of what we think of as sorcery. With the passage of time, we can see what might be called a gradual spiritualization of the notion of the magic power of knowledge. This is marked by a change in the objects commonly sought. There is a tendency to neglect the cruder, lower, human interests as ends to be attained by esoteric wisdom. The Upaniṣads, like the Atharva Veda, are still interested in quite ordinary, often all-too-human ends. Not only heavenly worlds, and freedom from old age and death, from danger and sorrow, but also worldly riches,

⁴² In my book on *The Bhagavad Gita*, Chicago, Open Court, 1925, p. 6 f.—Much might also be said of the views of the early Gnostics in this connexion.

conquering of enemies, sexual enjoyment, in short all kinds of human desires are sought by them thru mystic wisdom. But if we examine even such a comparatively early text as the Bhagavad Gītā, we shall hardly find there traces of the magical use of knowledge for what we might call trivial, worldly ends.⁴³ Nor do the best of the later systems attach much primary importance to such matters. The method is the same; but after all it does make a difference to what purposes it is applied. To be sure, some later Indian systems refer to *mahāsiddhis*, supernatural powers, as incidental benefits to be gained by the adept while he is progressing towards the final goal.⁴⁴ And we must not forget that the very word for knowledge, *vidyā*, means in classical Sanskrit also "magic". But the later philosophic systems in their highest moods make it clear that, while magic powers do indeed come with superior knowledge, they are quite unimportant. So far from being worthy ends in themselves, they are beneath the notice of the truly wise, who must seek only final salvation. For him who has that in his grasp, those lower aims simply cease to exist.

But the Bhagavad Gītā and the later systems, in so far as they follow the "way of knowledge",⁴⁵ agree with the thinkers of the Upaniṣads in their practical attitude towards speculation. They all seek the truth, not because of its abstract interest, but because in some sense or other they think that he who realizes the truth about man's place in the universe has *ipso facto*, directly, and by virtue of that knowledge, freed himself from all the troubles of life; in short, attained the *summum bonum*, whatever they conceive that to be. They are primarily religious rather than abstractly philosophical. And the historic origin of their attitude, in primitive ideas about the magic power of knowledge, is still perfectly clear in them, altho they sought to apply that power to loftier aims than their early predecessors did.⁴⁶

⁴³ The Gītā, by the way, prefers the "way of disciplined activity" (*yoga*) to the "way of knowledge" (*sāṅkhya*), tho it admits the validity of both. See footnote 23, above.

⁴⁴ These include such things as the powers of levitation, of making oneself indefinitely large or small, etc.

⁴⁵ See footnotes 23 and 43.

⁴⁶ It need hardly be said that all the higher forms of religion are recognized by every intelligent student as containing inheritances from very primitive times. Scholars who are well aware of this historic fact are not

I would not, however, be understood as minimizing the philosophic importance or the intellectual interest even of Vedic and Upaniṣadic thought. Some of the thinkers of those times show very keen mental powers. At their best their ideas strike every one as brilliant and fascinating. My admiration for them is warm and sincere. All I have tried to do is to sketch the intellectual background of the age in which they lived. They were children of that age; how could they be otherwise? The case is analogous to the humanization of the Rigveda by the modern school of Vedists, typified by my teacher Maurice Bloomfield, whose recent loss we mourn so deeply. He, perhaps more than any other, has taught us that the Rigvedic hymns are the work not of naïvely poetic dreamers raptly admiring the loveliness of the world about them, or meditating abstractedly on the grandeur of their gods, but of extremely practical professional priests, whose thoughts in these hymns never stray for long from the technical details of their ritual performances. But that does not mean that no poetry is left in the Rigveda. A practical priest, with one eye fixed on his professional interests, may and often does have the other eye open to impressions of beauty in nature. In the same way we can still do full justice to the magnificence of not a few speculative passages in the Vedas and Upaniṣads, even tho we must recognize that these philosophers had very definite practical ends in view in seeking truth.

thereby prevented from remaining true to the religion they hold. In the same way a recognition of the historic origin of Śankara's doctrine of salvation by knowledge need not imply a doubt of its philosophic validity. That is a question with which I am not concerned.

DID THE EARLY SEMITES OF ASIA MINOR USE THE ALPHABET?

FERRIS J. STEPHENS

YALE UNIVERSITY

MORE than a thousand cuneiform tablets have now been published containing the records of the business transactions of a community of Semitic merchants, who lived and traded in the region afterwards called Cappadocia, in the latter half of the third millennium B. C.¹ There is indirect evidence in these tablets that even at this early date these merchants also used another system of writing, which may have been a primitive North Semitic alphabet. It may be supposed that this primitive alphabet was written upon parchment or other perishable material, and it would be the rarest of good fortune if any actual remains of it should ever come to light. As evidence that another system of writing was in use the following facts are submitted.

A very unusual feature of the Cappadocian tablets is what has been called a word-divider. An upright wedge, sometimes only about half the length of the other upright wedges on the tablet, and having its head on a level with the top of the other signs, is frequently used with the obvious purpose of showing where one word ends and another begins. The scribes varied a great deal in their use of this device. There are texts in which it is missing entirely,² others in which it occurs only occasionally,³ and others in which it is found at the end of almost every word.⁴ The practice of using this quasi-punctuation is entirely unparalleled in other

¹ For discussion of the date see F. Thureau-Dangin, "La Date des Tablettes Cappadociennes," *RA*, Vol. 8, p. 142 ff.; G. Contenau, *Trente Tablettes Cappadociennes*, p. 6 f.

The following abbreviations are used in these notes: *BIN* = *Babylonian Inscriptions in the Collection of James B. Nies*; *CCT* = *Cuneiform Texts from Cappadocian Tablets in the British Museum*; *JRAS* = *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*; *LTC* = *Musée du Louvre, Département des Antiquités Orientales, Textes Cunéiformes*; *RA* = *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archéologie Orientale*.

² *LTC*, Vol. 14, No. 1; *CCT*, Vol. 1, Pl. 1; *BIN*, Vol. 4, No. 2; and others.

³ *LTC*, Vol. 14, No. 2; *BIN*, Vol. 4, No. 1 and No. 3.

⁴ *LTC*, Vol. 14, No. 3; *BIN*, Vol. 4, No. 9 and No. 10; *LTC*, Vol. 4, No. 14.

cuneiform literature. This fact alone suggests a calligraphic influence from some source other than Babylonia or Assyria.

A striking parallel to the word-divider is found in a number of monumental Semitic inscriptions in the alphabetic character. On the Moabite Stone there is a small dot at the end of words; the same is true of the Siloam Inscription. In nearly all the Zenjirli inscriptions, which are written in characters similar to those of the Moabite Stone, the same kind of dot occurs regularly at the end of each word. More than half a dozen inscriptions in the same character from the island of Cyprus, and one Punic inscription show the same phenomenon.⁵ The Aḥîrâm inscription at Byblos,⁶ the oldest of all known inscriptions in this character, dating from the thirteenth century B. C., also contains the word-divider.

At the period when Aramaic, written with pen and ink, and Assyrian cuneiform, written on clay, were used simultaneously in Ashur, we find an interesting mingling of the two systems of writing in some business records of the seventh century B. C., written in Aramaic characters scratched in clay.⁷ They too make use of the word-divider in the form of a round dot. They are the more interesting because their content is like that of the Cappadocian tablets.

It is to be noted that this dot tended to disappear in all late Semitic inscriptions. It is evident that its use at the end of words was a custom of Western Semites in the earliest periods from which written monuments have been preserved. Is it not reasonable to suppose that the early Semites of Cappadocia used it with their cuneiform because they were already familiar with the alphabetic script?

Other parallels to the word-divider show that it was a device connected with an alphabetic script. It is found frequently, for instance, in the Carian⁸ and Lycian⁹ inscriptions, and in one of

⁵ For the texts of these inscriptions see G. A. Cooke, *A Text-Book of North Semitic Inscriptions*.

⁶ See *Syria*, Vol. 5, 1924, p. 135 f.

⁷ See Mark Lidzbarski, *Altaramäische Urkunden aus Assur*.

⁸ See A. H. Sayce, "The Karian Language and Inscriptions," *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, Vol. 9, pp. 112-154. On page 137 he says, "The divisions between words are usually indicated in Karian by upright lines, points, or short lines above or below the letters."

⁹ See E. Kalinka, *Tituli Lyciae*.

the oldest texts from Sardis.¹⁰ The Cypriote syllabary¹¹ also uses it. The Etruscans who used a character very similar to the Phoenician alphabet used also the word-divider, and it was adopted from them by the Latin people who continued to use it in comparatively late times. Most interesting is its use in a script much older than these, namely that found on the island of Crete, which according to Sir Arthur Evans dates from about the same general period as the Cappadocian inscriptions. Unfortunately these Cretan inscriptions have not been published in any large number, and remain untranslated. Evans was of the opinion, however, that their linear script scratched in clay tablets was definitely related to the Phoenician alphabet. While his effort to make the Cretan script the origin of the Phoenician will probably not meet with final acceptance, there is no escaping the evident connection between them which he has shown.¹² Thus we have abundant evidence that the word-divider is something that belongs to the alphabetic system of writing. The Cappadocian use of it must therefore imply the knowledge of this system.

A second indication that the early Semites of Cappadocia made use of another system of writing is found in the occasional use of the word *sibru* in their cuneiform documents. In an article entitled, "Writing upon Parchment and Papyrus among the Babylonians and Assyrians,"¹³ Professor Dougherty has shown conclusively that in the Neo-Babylonian and Seleucid periods of Babylonian history two separate words were used for two kinds of scribes. The scribe who wrote upon clay was called a *dupšarru*, and the scribe who wrote upon parchment was called a *sipîru*. The root from which this word comes is, as he shows, the same as that from which the Hebrew *sepher* is derived. Professor Dougherty also shows that this root is to be clearly distinguished from a similar root, *šapâru*, which means, 'to send.' The *dupšarru* is often named in Cappadocian texts, and it would seem that the *sibru* corresponded to the *sipîru* of late Babylonian times. The following passages are illustrative of the use of the word.

¹⁰ See W. H. Buckler, *Sardis, Publications of the American Society for the Excavation of Sardis*, Vol. 6, Part 2, No. 30.

¹¹ See Wilhelm Larfeld, *Griechische Epigraphik*, p. 200-203.

¹² See Arthur J. Evans, *Scripta Minoa*, Vol. 1, p. 77 ff.

¹³ See this Journal, Vol. 48, pp. 109-135.

Kasbam ù zi-ba-zu šá-aš-ki-lá-ma a-na si-ib-ri šá a-lim¹⁴ di-na-ma, 'The silver and its interest weigh out, and unto the *sibru* of the city (council) give it.'¹⁴ Here the *sibru* seems to be the recording secretary of the city council.

Um-ma si-ib-ru šá ga-ri-im Ga-ni-eš ú ga-ru-um Wa-aḥ-šú-šá-na a-na Šá-ki-el-da-tim ú Bi-ru-tim šá Šá-lá-du-ar ki-bi-ma, 'Unto the Shakielatum and the Birutum of Shaladuwar speak. Thus (says) the *sibru* of the garum of Ganish and the garum of Wahshushana.'¹⁵ Here again the *sibru* seems to be the secretary of the assembly or garum.

$\frac{2}{3}$ *ma-na anakam a-šú-me A-be-a si-ib-ri-ku-nu aš-qul*, 'Two thirds of a mina of lead to the account of Abia, your *sibru*, I paid.'¹⁶ Note that in this passage the *sibru* is called by name, making it certain that he is a person.

A-na si-ib-ri-im ra-me-ni aš-ku-un-ma um-ma a-na-ku-ma . . ., 'Before a *sibru* I myself placed (it); thus I (spoke) . . .'¹⁷ The writer of this letter is discussing another letter which he dictated to a *sibru* or scribe.

The meaning 'scribe,' which fits these contexts is supported by etymological facts. The early Semites of Cappadocia always wrote the syllable *si* for *ši*,¹⁸ and hence it would be impossible to distinguish their spelling of *sipru*, for *sipīru*, 'scribe,' from *šipru*, 'message,' from the root *šapāru*. But it seems that the word *šipru*, 'message,' was not used by them; instead, another word from the same root, *našpirtu*, was used. Moreover, an impersonal meaning is out of the question in the passages quoted; hence it can not mean 'message.' The word *sibru* has been translated 'messenger' by both Lewy¹⁹ and Driver,²⁰ as though the word were *šipru*; but

¹⁴ *LTC*, Vol. 4, No. 45: 14 ff.

¹⁵ *LTC*, Vol. 4, No. 32: 1 ff.

¹⁶ *CCT*, Vol. 1, Pl. 29, Line 33.

¹⁷ *BIN*, Vol. 4, No. 35: 32 ff.

¹⁸ G. R. Driver has called attention to this point in *JRAS*, 1926, p. 730. The Cappadocian pronunciation of these sibilants before the vowel *i* is uncertain. It is possible that the sign commonly read *si* was pronounced *ši* in Cappadocian (see Thureau-Dangin, *Le Syllabaire Accadien*, p. 65, note 1). It is interesting to find the personal name *A-šir-šam-ši* (-*ši*) sometimes spelled out phonetically *A-šir-šá-am-si*; see the author's *Personal Names of Cappadocia*, Yale Oriental Series, Researches, XIII-1, p. 22.

¹⁹ See *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, Vol. 36, p. 27.

²⁰ See *RA*, Vol. 24, p. 158.

it is *mâr šipri* which means 'messenger,'²¹ not *šipru* alone. Hence it seems not unreasonable to conclude that *sibru* means 'scribe,' and in the light of Professor Dougherty's article mentioned above, that this kind of scribe wrote upon parchment.

Attention is drawn to three lesser considerations concerning the Cappadocian tablets which may point to the use of an alphabetic script. (1) The shortness of their syllabary. The most recently published Cappadocian sign list²² gives only 115 signs, which is a very much shorter list than that of any other period in cuneiform writing. Might we not expect that if a people, already familiar with the alphabetic script written on perishable material for ordinary purposes, should adopt the more cumbersome cuneiform for the sake of its greater accuracy and permanence, they would adopt it in as simple a form as possible? (2) The absence of double consonants. The well-known habit of failing to double consonants in the Cappadocian tablets may be another reflection of the influence of the alphabetic script, in which, apparently, double consonants were not written even though they were pronounced.²³ (3) The slant of the Cappadocian cuneiform signs. Nearly all the upright wedges in Cappadocian tablets have their heads leaning to the right instead of standing perpendicular as in other cuneiform writing. Is this the result of writing habits, derived from the North Semitic alphabet, which had practically no perpendicular strokes?

As a final bit of evidence for the hypothesis, note that there is strong reason for believing that these Semitic merchants were themselves Western Semitic, or Amorite in origin; and were not Assyrian or Babylonian as sometimes believed. Their personal names as well as the names of their gods have a very strong West Semitic character.²⁴ Moreover, there are some features of

²¹ See Muss-Arnolt, *A Concise Dictionary of the Assyrian Language*, p. 1090a.

²² By F. Thureau-Dangin, *LTC*, Vol. 14, p. 4 ff.

²³ This is pointed out by G. R. Driver in *JRAS*, 1926, p. 730.

²⁴ For the West Semitic character of the names attention may be called to the author's *Personal Names of Cappadocia*, p. 74 ff. Note especially the numerous names that are paralleled in Biblical names; many of these Biblical names will be found to belong to Northern Israelites.

The principal deities of the community, judging from their occurrence in personal names, were Adad, Amurru, Anu, Ashur, Dagan, Ilu (often written

the language of the tablets which seem to show West Semitic influence.²⁵

All these facts taken together give rise to a strong inference that the early Semites of Cappadocia used another system of writing besides the cuneiform, and that very likely this other system was an early form of the North Semitic alphabet. Such a conclusion has important bearing upon the question of the origin of the Semitic alphabet. In contrast to the various attempts to show that it originated in Egyptian hieroglyphic, or Sumerian cuneiform, or Minoan linear script, or what not, it may be in order to suggest that the Semitic alphabet had a Semitic origin. The early Semites of Cappadocia represent merely an offshoot of a great Semitic culture of northern Syria which, in the views of the late Professor Clay, was a seat of civilization antedating even that of Egypt and Babylonia. It is in that region that we should look for the origin of the Semitic alphabet.

El), Ishtar, Laban, Sin, and Shamash. For their West Semitic character see Clay, *The Empire of the Amorites*, p. 162 ff.

Sidney Smith has expressed himself as opposed to the view that the early Semites of Cappadocia represent an old Assyrian colony. See his *Early History of Assyria*, p. 150 f. He suggests for the Cappadocians and Assyrians a "common origin at a very much earlier period, before the Assyrians entered the land of Assyria at all, a view which would harmonize with a western or rather north-western origin of the Assyrians."

²⁵ See the article by G. R. Driver in *JRAS*, 1926, p. 729 ff.

A COLLECTION OF CHINESE PRAYERS

TRANSLATED WITH NOTES

HUANG K'UEI-YUEN AND J. K. SHRYOCK

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

INTRODUCTION

THE following prayers are taken from a small liturgical book used by officials of the province of Anhui when called upon to exercise religious functions. The book was presented to me by a Mr. Lin, an old man who had taken two degrees under the imperial examination system, now abolished. I cannot say to what extent these prayers are used under the republic. It is impossible to date them, but they are relatively modern, and I doubt whether any are older than the T'ang dynasty. The style is classical and carefully done, so in translating them the English of the Prayer Book has been used as far as possible in an attempt to reproduce their dignity. The prayers are partly prose, partly poetry, which is indicated by the typing, but no attempt has been made to put the poetry into English verse. In the notes, such well-known personages as Confucius, Buddha, and Kuanyin have been neglected. When not otherwise stated, the authority for the notes is the Tz'u Yuan, a source-book of words and phrases published by the Commercial Press, Shanghai, in 1917.

J. K. SHRYOCK.

University of Pennsylvania.

崇聖祠文

1. *A Prayer to the Five Ancestors of Confucius*¹

We dare come before the throne of Chao Shen Wang Mu Chin Fu Kung, Yu Shen Wang Ch'i Fu Kung, I Shen Wang Fang Su Kung, Ch'ang Shen Wang Po Hsia Kung, and Ch'i Shen Wang Su Liang Kung,² saying,

O five holy kings,
You have founded the family-principles
And have taught us civilization.

You have made the five generations prosperous.
 We will always offer sacrifices to you.
 The great doctrines of Confucius, established on the Chu and
 the Szu,
 Are imperishable for thousands of years.

Now it is spring (or autumn),³ wherefore we set forth these sacrificial animals, silk and fruits before you. May the virtuous Yen Tzu, Tseng Tzu, Confucius, and Mencius accompany you, and may you enjoy this sacrifice.⁴

¹ Every walled city in China has a Wen Miao, 文廟, usually called a Confucian temple by foreigners. Behind these are smaller temples, called Ts'ung Shen Tzu, 崇聖祠, which house the tablets of ancestors of Confucius for five generations.

² These are posthumous titles given to the ancestors of Confucius. The Chinese characters are; 肇聖王木金父公, 裕聖王祈父公, 詒聖王防叔公, 昌聖王伯夏公, 啓聖王叔梁公.

³ Confucius and his disciples receive sacrifices twice a year, on the first Ting 丁 day in spring and autumn, and similar offerings are made at that time in the Ts'ung Shen Tzu. The prayer is chanted before the altar and then burnt in the temple courtyard.

⁴ The Chu 洙 and the Szu 泗 are rivers, the former in Shangtung and the latter in northern Kiangsu. The Historical Records of Su-ma Ch'ien says that Confucius taught on their banks; Chavannes, *Mémoires Historiques*, Chap. 47.

Yen Hui was the favorite disciple of Confucius.

Tseng Tzu was the principal disciple of Confucius, and is credited with the authorship of the Great Learning.

Confucius is the Latinized form of K'ung Fu Tzu.

Mencius is the Latinized form of Meng Tzu, the best known of the later disciples of Confucius. His teaching is contained in the book which bears his name. These three disciples, and Confucius' grandson, Tzi Ssu, receive the greatest honor after the sage himself, but Confucius takes the place of his grandson here because the prayer is addressed to his own ancestors.

大成殿文

2. Prayer to Confucius

O great teacher, thy virtue¹ surpasses that of a thousand sages,
 And thy way excels that of a hundred kings.
 Rivalling the sun and moon,
 Thy light shines forever.

Truly there is none
Like thee among us.

The time is here for us who belong to the Wen Chiao Ch'ang Ming² society to observe the rules of propriety and to make music. Beating the bells and drums of the P'i Ying College,³ we offer thee sweet incense. Having gotten the water of the P'an,⁴ we present it to thee in the Pien and Tou⁵ sacrificial vessels.

Now it is spring (or autumn), wherefore we respectfully offer thee this sacrifice according to the ancient rites. The reverent and constant observance of thy moral teaching is the expression of our gratitude to thee. Mayest thou enjoy this sacrifice.

¹ Virtue, 德, and way, 道, go together and balance each other. Together they form the title of the book of Lao Tzu, but in this Confucian prayer the sense is somewhat different from the Taoist usage.

² Wen Chiao Ch'ang Ming, 文教昌明, is a complimentary name for a meeting of the Confucian literati.

³ The P'i Ying, 辟雍, College was an institution founded by the kings in ancient times, probably during the Chou period. The buildings had pools before them. *Tz'u Yuan*, Sect. Yiu, 酉, p. 167.

⁴ Confucian temples have semi-circular pools, called P'an, 泮, before them, probably in imitation of the ancient custom referred to in the preceding note.

⁵ Pien, 邊. These are sacrificial vessels made of bamboo for holding fruits.

Tou, 豆. These vessels are made of some other wood and hold pickled vegetables, minced meat and sauce.

關聖帝君文

3. *A Prayer to the God of War*¹

O Shen,² thy spirit fills the sky,
And thy red heart penetrates the sun.³
Thou didst support the legitimate throne
Manifesting loyalty and uprightness to man.
Thy majesty is known within the nine provinces.⁴
Thou hast attained the ideal,
And shown faithfulness and chastity to us.⁵
Thy name is above the Three Kingdoms.
Thy presence resides in the temples
Which are dedicated to thee throughout the world.
Thy spirit receives incense
Offered to thee throughout the generations.

Perform miracles and protect the people, we beseech thee. On this morning we humbly offer thee a sacrifice with feasting, beans, and libations of wine. Mayest thou enjoy this sacrifice.⁶

¹ The God of War is a well-known historical character, Kuan Yu, 關羽, died 219 A. D., of the Three Kingdoms period. He supported his friend, Liu Pei, 劉備, for the throne in the disorder that followed the downfall of the Han dynasty, and as Liu is regarded as the proper successor of the Hans, Kuan Yu is considered as helping legitimate rulers during civil disorders. After adventures which have made him one of the great popular heroes of China, he was captured and executed.

² The word romanized as Shen 神 throughout these prayers is the word meaning spirit or god.

³ "Red heart," 丹心, is a poetical expression signifying loyalty, and is coupled with the sun in inscriptions in the temples to Kuan Yu. Loyalty is the characteristic virtue of Kuan, and of the others who have tablets in his temple, such as Yo Fei, 岳飛, who has recently been placed on an equality with Kuan Yu.

⁴ China proper is now divided into eighteen provinces, but in ancient times there were nine, although the division varied under the different dynasties. There are various legends about the origin of the system, and it is attributed to the Yellow Emperor and others. The phrase means the whole country.

⁵ Chastity refers to an incident in Kuan Yu's career, when he was tempted by being forced to spend the night in a room with his friend's wife. He stood in the doorway with a lighted candle in his hand during the entire night.

⁶ There are Wu Miao, 武廟, or Military Temples, corresponding to those to Confucius, throughout China, and twice a year, in spring and autumn, sacrifices are made by the chief military officials of the district.

拜祖文

4. *Prayers to Ancestors*¹

The movements of the spirits are without trace, now brightly manifested, now mysteriously hid. In their royal chariots they wander about, tranquil wherever they go. Their souls dwell in heaven; their tablets are in the rear-apartment. Their sons and grandsons remember them with filial thoughts forever and ever.²

O Shen, now you confront us, and now you pass by us, ascending and descending, unrestricted and unlimited by time and space. The rear-apartment is tranquil and felicitous. Your souls dwell in heaven³ and your tablets are in the home. Your descendants will remember you with filial thoughts for myriads of years.

* The Chinese ideas of the soul are rather intricate. From ancient times each individual has been considered to have two souls, which are now called Huen, 魂, and P'ò, 魄, and correspond to the two principles Yin, 陰, and Yang, 陽. These two have been still further divided until now there are three Huen and seven P'ò. One of the three Huen resides in heaven, and another in the tablet.

佛祖文

The multitudes owe their existence to thy divine help ;
And thy powerful merit established a religion for thy people.
We look up to thy golden image, sixteen feet high,
And thy spiritual visage ever manifests itself.
Listening to thy teaching,
Which is like the voice of a lion coming from the third heaven,²
We honor thee without ceasing.
We pray to thee, O Father Buddha,
Who art of the Chu Tan family,³
And whose personal sign is goodness and wisdom.
In the exposition of thy spiritual teaching
Thou hast included the myriad worlds like rain dropping from
 heaven ;
Thy doctrine of the revolving cycle ⁴
Carries us back beyond the Three Teachings.⁵
Like a sword
It purges our hearts of sensuousness.
Constantly thou hast sprinkled sweet dew from the tips of the
 branches ;
At times thou dost pluck the petals of the golden lotus blooming
 below thy seat.⁶

Nothing is so small as to escape thy understanding;
And thy wisdom has penetrated the three heavens.
Whatever thou dost touch will be efficacious,
And thy face shines upon the best in humanity.

It is now the twelfth month, and the festival of thy holy nativity. Flaky clouds cover the sky and float about thy solitary shrine in a rainbow. The ice which fills the green pond shines in gleaming layers. We, thy humble worshippers have gathered together to declare our deep appreciation of thy great virtue. To thee, O Shen, we burn corded incense which will penetrate the corners of this ancient temple. To thee we offer food, and calamus like the pink plum-blossoms, pure and slender. The happy halos shine among the colored clouds, sublime and beautiful. The rain of thy grace is falling and fills the boundless realms of the spirit. We sing of long life and eternity; we ever turn toward thee as sunflowers toward the sun. O Shen, Father Buddha, increase thy gracious blessings and draw near to us. In fear and trembling we pray to thee. Mayest thou hear us.

¹ The prayer is addressed to the historic Buddha. He is usually the central one of three huge, gilded, and similar figures which occupy the place of honor in the main hall of Buddhist temples of the Ch'an, 禪, or Meditative, School, which is prevalent throughout China.

² The teaching of the Buddha is often compared with the roar of a lion. [Cf. the Sanskrit *siṃhanāda*, 'lion's roar,' often used of the Buddha's pronouncements in India.—Ed.] The third and highest group of Buddhist heavens is that in which all desire has been lost.

³ Chu Tan, 瞿曇, or Ch'iao Ta Mo, 喬答摩, which is a transliteration of Gautama, is given as the family name of the Buddha. I do not know why this is so, since the Chinese transliterate Sakya by Shih Chia, 釋迦. [Gautama was originally a gentile name; the Buddha's personal name was Siddhārtha.—Ed.]

⁴ The Buddhist doctrine of the wheel. [Query: Is it not the *samsāra*, the 'round of existences,' rather than the 'wheel' (of the law)?—Ed.]

⁵ The word Chiao, 教, is usually translated as religion, but the word teaching is more accurate.

⁶ The Buddhas sit upon open lotus flowers, which are gilded.

觀音大士文

6. *A Prayer to Kuanyin*¹

The essential doctrine of the Confucianists is to understand principles,
 While that of Buddha is universal salvation.
 From the midst of thy white light
 Thou dost brighten the thousand worlds,
 And within the purple bamboo²
 Thou openest the gate of the True Law.³
 Keeping clean water,
 Thou bestowest sweet dew on man.⁴
 Stepping on the lotus,⁵
 Thou givest increase to the flower petals on earth.
 This is our salvation.

Now is the time of the wheat-harvest and the anniversary of thy ascending to the lotus-throne. Looking up, we see thy glorious face and diamond body⁶ descending. We, who are fortunate to be on earth, enjoy thy blessings and protection. O goddess, let thy Buddha-light shine upon us universally, and give a yearly increase of grain, we beseech thee. Give us power and protect us, so that the generations may enjoy happiness and the people remember thy grace forever. In fear and trembling we pray to thee. Mayest thou hear us.

¹ Kuanyin, 觀音, in Sanskrit, Avalokiteshvara, and in Japanese, Kwanon, is the well-known Bodhisattva who has been widely studied by western scholars. Here the deity is a woman, the Goddess of Mercy.

² Kuanyin is said to reside in a grove of purple, or bitter, bamboo.

³ The phrase "Gate of the Law," 法門, is used by both Confucianists and Buddhists. Ku Liang's commentary, 穀梁傳, on the Spring and Autumn Annals says, "The gate of the law is the south gate." The ruler sat there to dispense justice.

The Buddhist meaning, which is the one intended here, is metaphorical, and implies the gate of right principle, through which all Buddhists must pass. Law, or Dharma, is one of the three essentials of Buddhism.

⁴ The phrase "sweet dew," 甘露, is common in Chinese, and is frequently used by Buddhists, sometimes for rain and dew, sometimes for blessings in general.

⁵ Volumes could be written on the use of the lotus in Buddhist symbolism. Buddhist divinities sit on lotus thrones, the Bodhisattvas wear lotus

hats, there are lotus plants in the Western Heaven, and so on. This reference is to the representation of Kuanyin standing on a lotus, in which way she is said to have crossed the sea.

^a Diamond body here means one that is indestructible (Skt. *vajra*).

地藏王 文

7. *A Prayer to Ti Tsang*¹

The jade tablet is in Hua Shan,² and the people of the four quarters tremble before thee. Thy glory is everlasting, and thy servants will always offer thee incense and virtue.

Now we, thy humble servants, with the members of the society,³ respectfully come before thee, the Master of Hades,⁴ praying:

O king, descended from a royal line,⁵
Thou art full of love and righteousness.
Thou dost look at nations as passing clouds,
Thou hast no joy in worldly honey.
Loving sweet incense,
Thou hast become a companion of the immortals,
And art enjoying happiness in heaven.
Great is thy love;
For the sake of man
Thou hast passed through the miserable seas.⁶
Wide is thy understanding;
Thy mercy, like light,⁷
Is shining upon the whole world.

We, who are fortunate in being born in this blessed generation, behave virtuously and practise our professions with diligence. This is due to thy merciful instruction and protection.

Autumn is here. The weather is fair and the air fresh. It is meet and right for us to celebrate thy glorious and holy nativity.⁸ O Shen, open the gate of heaven and look down upon us, Receive the clean water which we offer thee and the willow branches with which we have sprinkled it.⁹ The light of holy candles has reached heaven and penetrated thy inner palace. We give food to those in Hades, and the wandering spirits are grateful to thee.¹⁰ O king, we see thy face through our prayers, and we know thy efficacy by thy manifestations. Protect us in the future as in the past, and pardon us, who repent. Send down happiness, honor and goodness. In fear and trembling we pray to thee. Mayest thou hear us.

¹ Ti Tsang, 地藏, is one of the four great Bodhisattvas of Chinese Buddhism, the others being Kuanyin, 觀音, Wen Shu, 文殊, and P'u Hsien, 普賢. Each is associated with a sacred mountain. Ti Tsang means Earth Treasure, and corresponds to the Sanskrit Kshitigarbha. In Japan the god is worshipped as Jizo.

² Chiu Hua Shan, 九華山, or the mountain of the Nine Flowery Peaks, in southern Anhwei, is associated with Ti Tsang. I know nothing about the jade tablet, although I visited the mountain in 1918.

³ It is common for pious Buddhists to form societies for the worship of particular deities, for pilgrimages, and for similar religious objects.

⁴ Ti Tsang's particular function is to rescue souls from punishment in the Buddhist purgatory.

⁵ Ti Tsang was incarnated in a prince of Korea who became a monk and took up his residence on Chiu Hua Shan in the 8th Century A. D.

⁶ "The miserable seas" refers to Ti Tsang's voluntary passage through purgatory for the purpose of saving the souls there.

⁷ A crozier and a jewel are associated with Ti Tsang. At the sight of the light which shines from the jewel, the gates of purgatory fly open.

⁸ Ti Tsang's birthday is the last day of the seventh month, but this may refer to an autumn festival on Chiu Hua Shan connected with the prince of Korea. Many make pilgrimages to the mountain at that time.

⁹ Willows are considered to be connected with rain.

¹⁰ The festival of Feeding the Hungry Ghosts, or the Yu Lan Hwei, 盂蘭會 is peculiarly connected with Ti Tsang. As a Buddhist custom this festival, which occurs on the 15th of the seventh month, can be traced back to the 8th Century A. D. Authorities differ as to whether the custom was brought from India, or is a Buddhist adaptation of a Chinese observance. The Book of Rites records sacrifices to wandering spirits at about the same time of the year, but, on the other hand, there is a similar custom in India in connection with the Hindu Pretas. The rite includes sprinkling water and grains of rice for the hungry ghosts, and the placing of lights upon the water. See Monier Williams, *Buddhism*, p. 219; Clennell, *Historical Development of Religion in China*, p. 105; Eifel, *Handbook of Buddhism*, Art. Amogha, p. 8; Johnston, *Buddhist China*, p. 369; *Li Ki*, or *Book of Rites*, Sect. Yueh Ling.

文昌帝君文

8. A Prayer to Wen Ch'ang, the God of Literature¹

O Ti,² thou hast bequeathed the virtues
Of loyalty and filial piety to us,
And makest manifestations
Of civilization forever.
Thy Yin Chien is the foundation of ethics,

And thy Chia Ch'uan the accomplishment of the will of
superior men.³

Thou dost select the virtuous and choose the talented

Without misusing thy authority.

Thou dost record the merits and the faults

Of the people without bias.

All scholars depend upon thee

For protection and progress.⁴

Today we make this humble sacrifice to thee, praying that thy great virtues will be widely spread. Lead us in the way of enlightenment and cover us with thy glorious light, so that finally we may attain the blessed heavens. Mayest thou enjoy this sacrifice.

¹Wen Ch'ang, 文昌, not Confucius, is the God of Literature. He is said to have been a man named Chang Ya, who lived at Tzu T'ung in Szechuan during the T'ang period. He was a brilliant writer and refused office. However, this is only one of the many incarnations of the god, who is a stellar deity connected with the Great Bear. He is usually associated with K'uei Hsin and the Golden Armor Worthy.

²Ti, 帝, is an ancient word about whose origin and meaning there is some dispute. It was applied to ancient rulers in the classics, and since Ch'in Shih Huang has been a title of the emperor. Here it means god.

³The Yin Chien, 陰鸛, and the Chia Ch'uan, 蕉窗, are Taoist writings. They do not belong to the ancient period.

⁴Wen Ch'ang was worshipped by scholars about to take the government examinations. I know of one instance, near T'ai Hu of the province of Anhui, where his worship was connected with a tree cult, but I do not know whether this is general.

奎星文

9. *A Prayer to K'uei Hsin*¹

O Shen, thou dost glorify the Purple Han,²

And dost aid human progress.

Beneath thy rule, each family is able to have its glory;

By the help of thy wheel, every scholar is able to advance.³

Thou art on the constellation above the three terraces⁴

Looking happily at the glow of sunset and the deep blue sky.

On the head of the red-banded sea-monster thou dost rise

above the four seas,⁵

Gazing joyfully at the passing osprey and the flying rukh.

The elevation of scholars

Depends upon thy spiritual power.

We respectfully make this sacrifice to thee to show our gratitude. Mayest thou enjoy this sacrifice.

¹ K'uei Hsin, 奎星, is a star deity, and is associated with Wen Ch'ang as a patron of literature.

² The Purple Han, 紫漢, is a Chinese name for the Milky Way.

³ K'uei Hsin sits on the Great Bear, which the Chinese call the Wheel. Like Wen Ch'ang, he is worshipped by scholars.

⁴ The three terraces are six stars arranged in pairs below the Great Bear. As the prayer says nothing about the time of year, it is impossible to identify them exactly, but they appear to be in Cassiopea.

⁵ K'uei Hsin rides upon the Ao, 鰲, a fabulous sea-monster, and there are many representations of him standing on this fish, with a writing-brush in his hand.

"The four seas," 四海, is a common Chinese expression, and refers to a belief that the world, of which China is the center, is surrounded by oceans on the north, south, east and west. In the *Analects*, Confucius says that if a man behaves in the right way, "within the four seas all will be his brothers," meaning everyone.

城隍神像開光文

10. *A Prayer to the City-God*¹

O Shen, thy loyalty was shown to the Han dynasty,²
And thou didst establish the throne of Ch'ih Ti for four
hundred years.³

Bless the state of Wan,
And receive a million years of incense from Kiang Nan.⁴

On this morning, when thou dost descend upon thy throne, we look for thy blessings. We have made thy image and now are painting the pupils of thy eyes.⁵ Our hearts filled with reverence, we are longing for thy light to shine upon us. We fear and tremble before thy majesty. We have washed the golden wine-cup and drink to thee. With offerings of mushrooms we praise thee, and we long for thee as sunflowers long for the sun. Dwell in thy palace and awake those who pass by.⁶ Thou art the star of happiness on the way, and thy chariot halts at the weed-door.⁷ Thou art our god, and the Living Buddha of Lu Wan.⁸ Not only thy followers are under thy curtain of protection, but all the inhabitants of the district receive thy blessing.⁹ Mayest thou enjoy this sacrifice.

¹ In China every political division has its patron deity, and among these the city-gods are the most prominent and popular. The earliest reference to the cult is in the 3rd century A. D., but Chinese scholars think that it has connections with the much earlier worship of the Gods of the Land and Grain. The cult shows both Buddhist and Taoist influences. The City-God is the tutelary divinity of the town, and corresponds in the spirit world to the district magistrate. He reports on the behavior of the inhabitants to Yenlo, 閻羅, or Yama, the God of Purgatory. See Grube, *Religion und Kultus der Chinesen*, p. 125 f.

² One of the numerous legends about the City-God states that he was a loyal follower of the founder of the Han dynasty, and was named Chi Hsin, 紀信.

³ Ch'ih Ti, 赤帝, means the Red-Hot God, or the God of the South, but the reference is probably to the founder of the Han dynasty.

⁴ Wan, 白皖, is an ancient name for the present province of Anhui. It is still used as the literary name for the province.

Kiang Nan, 江南, or South of the River, is an old name for a political division approximating the present provinces of Kiangsu and Anhui.

⁵ This prayer is used at the consecration of an image of the City-God. This consists of the sacrifice of a cock, and the formal dotting of the pupils in the eyes of the image. Until the eyes are dotted, the image is nothing more than the sum of the materials which compose it, but afterwards it becomes holy, and the dwelling place of the god.

⁶ The palace means the temple of the god, who is responsible for the behavior of the people. The prayer asks that when the people pass the temple, they may be awakened to a sense of sin and a desire for virtue.

⁷ This sentence probably refers to the procession of the god through the city. Weed-door, 蓬門, is the polite way in which a man would refer to his own home.

⁸ This is not a Buddhist prayer, but the Chinese use the Buddhist terms, such as Buddha and Bodhisattva, very loosely. Lu Wan, 六安, is the province of Anhui.

⁹ Groups of young men form associations in the service of the god. They dress as ghosts, or Kuei, 鬼, serving in the temple and walking in the procession. The meaning is that not only these men, but all the inhabitants of the district, living and dead, are under the control of the god.

祈安文

11. *A Prayer for Peace and Health*

I reverently kneel before the tablets of the Great Planet and the spirits of the stars, saying; ¹

The Tao of Heaven loves to give birth,²
And all creatures are clothed with heavenly grace.
The saving power of the spirits

Has protected the people below.
 Though we have unexpected calamities,
 Your power is great and ready to save us.
 We are born into this world;
 With our life, breath is given,
 And with our nature, body is formed.³
 The spirit attached to the flesh is P'ò;
 The soul subjoined to the breath is Huen.

I, your humble servant, am firm and diligent all day long, fearing that I may commit sin against you; I am watchful and reverent, always hoping that I may not offend your wisdom. O Shen, the five elements are not harmonious, and the Great Decree is not fortunate.⁴ Suddenly on the . . . day of the . . . month of this year, I, your humble servant, fell sick. I have no peace waking nor sleeping, and my body knows no comfort. Fearing that my sins may be piled high as a mountain, and that I may have offended against your will, on this day I reverently kneel in prayer to you. O spirits of the stars, look down upon me and give me the sweet dew of your grace. Forgive me all that is past, and grant that I may ever hereafter live a righteous and fortunate life in your light. Help me to rid myself of evil habits; restore me to health, and enable me to spend the residue of my life to your glory and in the service of my parents. Your grace is boundless, and I will be thankful to you forever. With whole-hearted reverence and sincerity I pray to you.

¹ The Great Planet, 太歲, is Jupiter, which here is called the year star, because as early as the Han period it was noticed that it moved round the sun once yearly, which it does in a Ptolemaic system.

² "The Tao of Heaven," 天道, is a very old phrase, and is found in the Book of Changes, the Book of History, Tso's Commentary on the Spring and Autumn Annals, and the Kuo Yu, or Remarks Concerning the States. A literal, but inadequate, translation would be the Heavenly Principle.

³ Such words as Ch'í, 氣, or breath, and Hsin, 性, or Nature, are technical terms in Chinese thought, each of which would require a separate monograph to explain adequately. The distinctions here are uniformly dualistic. What might be called the theological background of this prayer is very carefully done.

⁴ The five elements are wood, earth, fire, water and metal, and correspond to many other groups of five. This grouping is very old, and many such classifications are found in the Erh Ya, an ancient encyclopedia. Health depends on the harmony of these five elements.

"The theory of the five elements has its germ, perhaps, in old cosmological speculations, but it did not take its development and systematic form until the beginning of the 3rd Century B.C. with Tseou Yen"; Chavannes, *Mémoires Historiques*, Intro. p. CXLIV.

Ming, 命 or the Decree, is used both as Fate, and as the Command of Heaven.

送子娘娘文

12. *A Prayer to the Goddess Who Grants Male Offspring*¹

O goddess, bright pearls are found in old oysters;
Such is nature's wonderful way of generating the genius.
Red and horned calves are brought forth by brindled cows;
Such is Heaven's marvelous method of fostering the fairest.
Listening to the three-fold blessings
Pronounced on Hua Shan,²
One is assured of many sons,
And the attainment of happiness.
Reading the poems of old P'o,³
One is satisfied with possessing sons,
Though deprived of public office.
O goddess, thou dost function in accordance with the love of
Heaven and Earth;⁴
Thou dost officiate in granting descendants to the multitudes.
Thou desirest that no man should have the sorrow of Po Toa;⁵
Thou dost send dreams of bears,⁶
So that every family may be filled
With the felicity of Feng Yang.⁷

Now we reverently commemorate thy holy nativity, and we look up respectfully to thy compassionate face. We have brought water-plants before thee to show the desire of our hearts; O let the happy haze form the splendor of P'eng Lai.⁸ We offer thee petals of incense; O let the sweet smelling smoke diffuse through the palace. Grant to us soon the gift of stone unicorns,⁹ we beseech thee, so that earthly toys may be supplanted by jade trinkets. Give us gemmy martins, we pray thee, so that the hugging of sons may be followed by the hugging of grandsons. Grant us sons and enlarge our kitchen stone.¹⁰ Make them like the phoenixes of the Hsieh family and the dragons of the Hsun family,¹¹ admirable and filial.

Multiply our descendants like insects, and make our offspring as numerous as melon seeds. O goddess, may those within thy light be always protected and blessed by thee. Mayest thou enjoy this sacrifice.

¹ I am unable to give much information about the Sung Tzu Niang Niang, 送子娘娘, or Son-Giving Mother. She is much worshipped and occasionally has temples of her own, but usually appears in the temple of some other divinity, like the City-God. This goddess is not Kuanyin, though the latter is often besought for the same purpose.

² Hua Shan, 華山, is Chiu Hua Shan, 九華山, or the mountain of the Nine Flowerly Peaks, in southern Anhui, which is one of the four sacred Buddhist mountains of China.

³ "Old P'ao" is Su Tung P'ao, 蘇東坡, 1036-1101 A.D., the celebrated poet of the Sung period.

⁴ The phrase "Heaven and Earth" is very common in Chinese literature. Here it symbolizes the male and female principles of the universe.

⁵ Po Tao, 伯道, was a man of the Five Dynasties period, who saved his dead brother's child from drowning at the sacrifice of his own, and later was unable to have more children.

⁶ A dream of bears is an omen of the birth of a son. There is a reference to it in the Book of Poetry.

⁷ Feng Yang 汾陽, was the name of a palace built at Ch'ing Lo Hsien, 靜樂縣, by Yang Ti, 楊帝, of the Sui, 隋, dynasty in 608 A.D. The name is synonymous with happiness. See Giles, *Chinese Biographical Dictionary*, p. 907.

⁸ P'eng Lai, 蓬萊, is one of three enchanted islands in the Yellow Sea. Taoist imagination has peopled the island with immortals, all white. There are palaces built of yellow gold and white silver. See Mayers, *Chinese Reader's Manual*, p. 187.

⁹ Unicorns, 麒麟, or Ch'i Lin, is a poetical reference to the birth of good and dutiful sons.

¹⁰ "To enlarge the kitchen stone" means to increase the family prestige.

¹¹ Some of the poetical references in this prayer I am unable to identify, and among them is the allusion to the Hsieh, 薛, family. The dragons of the Hsun, 荀, family refers to the eight sons of Hsun Shu, d. A. D. 1499. See Mayers, *Chinese Reader's Manual*, p. 212.

求雨滅蝗蝻文

13. A Prayer to the God of Locusts¹

In the presence of the God of Locusts we pray;

O Shen, thou art efficient,
And dost love the people below.

The people form the nation,
And food is the life of the people.

We labor during three seasons. We toil from sunrise until night, without regard to weather, until we are worn out. Our sweat is like drops of blood. When the sowing is over, we hope for a good harvest, that we may pay our tax to the government and feed ourselves; to have enough for our beasts below, and to offer in sacrifice to the spirits above. We pray thee in spring, we offer sacrifice to thee in autumn, for we dare not neglect our duties.

O Shen, if the harvest be not good, the people will have nothing and cannot live. We have heard that there is a plague of locusts in the neighboring district. The faces of the people there are washed with tears, and their hearts are broken. Fortunately our district has had no such calamity; it is thy power, O Shen, which has sent them away and prevented their coming. Thy mercy is great and thy protection wide. Thy grace rivals that of Heaven and Earth, filling the highest and the deepest places. O Shen, we beseech thee, remember the loving kindness of the sage-kings, and carry out the merciful plan of Shang Ti.² Transform the locusts into fishes and shrimps, and send them into the rivers and seas; or change them into birds and make them dwell in mountains and forests; or transmute them into cicadas of autumn and let them sing on high trees; or turn them into dragonflies and bid them drink the sweet dew of the air; or transform them into butterflies and give them a happy new life; or make them fireflies to help scholars study at night;³ or send them away to the banks of the Southern Sea by thunder, lightning, wind, and rain, as the Shen did to the crocodile of Tsao Chou in answer to the prayer of Han Wen Kung.⁴ Then they cannot harm the people, nor struggle with other creatures. We, thy humble people, who long to live and do not wish to die, pray thee to look down upon us and hear our pitiful cries. Grant us a jade-harvest,⁵ that we may enjoy the music of peace and prosperity. In fear and trembling we offer thee this sacrifice. Mayest thou hear us.

² Exactly who this God of Locusts is I cannot say. There are a number of deities who are connected with locusts. There is the Pa Chia, or God of the Eight Kinds of Creatures, who drives away locusts, and a God of Frogs, who eat locusts, is worshipped in the Yangtse Valley. This seems to be a God of the Locusts themselves.

* Shang Ti, 上帝, is interchangeable with Heaven, and stands for a supreme deity. It would not be very inaccurate to translate it by our word God. In the Book of History and other classics, Shang Ti is practically monotheistic, and although other divinities are recognized and worshipped, they are his servants and carry out his will.

* This refers to the old story of a scholar who was too poor to buy light, and so was able to study at night by the light from a number of fireflies that he caught. The story is mentioned in the Three Characters Classic.

* Han Yu, 韓愈, or Han Wen Kung, 韓文公, was a famous scholar of the T'ang period. When banished to Tsao Chou, 潮州, in South China in 803 A.D., he found the people there suffering from the depredations of a crocodile. Han wrote an essay which he threw into the river, and the attacks ceased. Wen Kung, 文公, is a title, meaning the Duke of Literature.

* Jade-harvest means an unusually good harvest.

謝雨文

14. *A Thanksgiving for Rain*¹

O Shen, thy merits are great;
The cereals of the four seasons depend upon thee.
O Ti, thy virtue is deep;
The growth of all plants is due to thy gracious help.

A few days ago we reverently visited thy altar and prayed for sweet rain in thy presence. O Shen, thou hast looked down upon us with compassion, and listened to our prayer. Thou art merciful to us, and hast granted what we asked.

The diamond-rain poured
And the sweet dew flowed,
So that the fields on the high mountains
Have been irrigated.
Oxen plodded happily,
Ploughing a thousand fields;
Horses galloped about,
Carrying rice-shoots to be transplanted in ten thousand Ching.²
The young and the old,
Men and women, are all happy;
Sorrow and the fear
Of having no grain to eat are gone.
The earth is full of happiness,

And the heaven, of glory,
For thou hast given us rain,
Which means grain and gold.

Therefore we respectfully present to thee this pure grape wine and these ripe fruits of the mountain, to thank thee for thy loving kindness and gracious protection. O Shen, display thy efficiency and be merciful to thy people. Mayest thou enjoy this sacrifice.

¹ There is nothing in this prayer to show exactly what divinity is approached. Probably it is either a God of the Land and Grain, or a Dragon King, 龍王. The dragons are rain gods.

² Two different words for fields are used in the Chinese. Ching, 井, is a very old term for ploughed fields.

滅瘟疫文

15. *A Prayer for Deliverance from Plague*

Devoutly we kneel before the throne of the Chen Jen and the Yuan T'an, saying; ¹

O you who store the universe in a gourd,
The fame of your mystery is boundless.
Your magic can subdue dragons and tigers;
All respect your immortal knowledge.
Your mercy relieves men from misery,
And your power guards against calamities.
With rich ritual the former kings celebrated you.
Your love is immeasurable;
You save men and help beasts.
All depend upon you.

Now the plague rages in the neighboring district, but you have protected us with the Southern Mountain.² Oh Shen, we look to your spiritual efficiency and depend upon your mysterious way. Therefore we have built this altar to you, with incense burning in the pots; we have drawn the images of five men tied and sealed.³ O Shen, display your mystery; manifest your power, and show your glory, that your people may be protected, we beseech you. Whatever is prohibited by you, ceases. Deliver us, O Shen, from the punishment of Heaven, and save all creatures from pestilence and

death. May we put on bamboo hats and raincoats, singing together with the cowherds of the fields.⁴ Women will be happy because the barns and boxes are full of grain. O Shen, send the plague to the wilderness, and drive the spirit of pestilence to the desert. With all our hearts we promise you a play, to be given to your glory.⁵ Reverently and respectfully we pray you to hear us.

¹ Most of these prayers show various influences, but this is clearly a Taoist prayer. Chen Jen, 真人, or True Men, is a Taoist term for those who have gained Tao and immortality. I believe that the term was first used by Chuang Tzu, 莊子 who considers Lao Tzu, 老子, and Kuan Yin Tzu, 關尹子, as the Chen Jen of the ancients.

I think that Yuen T'an, 元壇, is the equivalent of Yuen Chun, 元君, another Taoist term, which is applied to female immortals.

² There are five sacred mountains of Taoism. The southern mountain is Heng Shan, 衡山, in the province of Hunan. I do not know why this mountain in particular is mentioned here.

³ I regret that I do not know to what this interesting passage refers. It is probably a piece of imitative magic. It may be that the drawing of a picture supplanted an older custom of human sacrifice.

⁴ The plague was evidently one which would be terminated by a heavy rain.

⁵ On occasions of this kind it was formerly the custom of the Chinese to give theatrical performances in honor of the gods, and the practice can still be seen in villages. Temples which show Taoist influences frequently have stages for theatricals just inside the main entrance. These plays were not necessarily religious themselves, but were given "to amuse the god." Sometimes they were held in Gild Halls, while in the country a stage is erected outside the village, and a travelling troupe of actors hired for the purpose. Wang Kuo Wei, 王國維, a contemporary Chinese authority on the drama, considers that the Chinese theater grew from the religious dances of the ancient exorcists called Wu, 巫. Other Chinese authorities place the beginnings of their drama in the T'ang period, and one, Ma Tuan Lin, 馬端臨, puts it as early as the 6th Century A. D. The ancient dances to which Wang Kuo Wei refers seem to have been pantomimes. See *Encycl. of Religion and Ethics*, Art. "Drama, Chinese"; Zucker, *The Chinese Theater*, Chap. I.

火神文

16. A Prayer to the Fire-God¹

O Shen, sitting in the city of the south,
Thou rulest over summer;²
Rivalling water,
Thou dost help the people in their daily life.

Thou givest birth to the earth,
And dost cause air to circulate.

In this world, we are under thy grace and protection. Though we lack knowledge of fire, we are fortunate in having no calamities, scorching our heads and smashing our foreheads. All is thy efficiency. When we think of the obscure desert,³ we are heartily ashamed that we have not given what is due thee. Last month we promised to feed the spirits, and so this evening we humbly and respectfully burn incense in conformity with the rites. Like sun-flowers we open our hearts toward thee, and we make this sacrifice to feed those in the underworld. Having cleansed our hearts we make this humble oblation to thee. Thy grace is ever increasing. Mayest thou hear us.

¹ There are a number of stories about this legendary being. He is said to have been a minister of the Yellow Emperor, to have been a contemporary of Fu Hsi, to be identical with Ch'ung Li, and to have been a man named Lo, who was appointed as the Fire-God by Chiang T'ai Kung. There is nothing historical about these tales. The god punishes sin by fire. He has four generals, and an army of 3000 fire-soldiers. The soldiers burn the houses of common people, the generals are sent to the mansions of officials, while when it is necessary to fire the palace of the emperor, the god himself is the incendiary. See Giles, *Biographical Dictionary*, p. 179.

² Another name given to this deity is Nan Yang Ta Ti, 南陽大帝, or the Great God of the Southern Universe, where he is supposed to dwell. The god is also connected with summer, the hottest time of the year.

³ "The obscure desert," 冥漠, is a name for the Desert of Gobi, but here the meaning is Hades, the place of departed spirits.

灶神文

17. *A Prayer to the Kitchen-God*¹

O Shen, the superintendent of our eastern kitchen,²
Our whole family depends upon thee as our lord.
Thy festival is in the summer;³
The sacrifice in honor of thee is unique
Among the five sacrifices.⁴
The food we offer to thee as our teacher
Is different from the primitive victims,
Yet still has the hair and feathers.⁵

In preparing the premier's porridge⁶
 Our best wishes are shown in the thorough cooking
 With the burning firewood.
 Fuel cut from the sycamores
 Is free from the dirt of scorching and burning;
 Our beef and venison cannot be free
 From the taint of sheep or goat
 Without thy efficiency.⁷
 Thy merits equal those of Sui Jen, who discovered fire;⁸
 Thy influence equals that of the Great Creator.
 Extend thy mercy and love, we pray thee,
 And forgive us our sins of irreverence and negligence, we
 beseech thee.

It is the 15th of the 8th month, and the morn of thy glorious advent.⁹ Following the example of the loud adoration on the sacred Sung mountain,¹⁰ we bless thee by erecting a sacred tablet to thee between high peaks, that we may express our gratitude to thee for nourishing our bodies and spirits. To stand before thee and offer sacrifice, we must be pure in heart. O Shen, reverently we have set forth the viands before thee in the family hall. May we humbly hope that thou wilt abide genially in the midst of the lucky smoke,¹¹ so that we may all be satisfied in our surroundings, with harmony and virtue. O Shen, open wide the gates of the everlasting kingdom, and let us abide always in the region of happiness and satisfaction. With awe and reverence we, thy servants, worship and adore thee. In fear and trembling we pray to thee. Mayest thou hear us.

⁶ A picture of the Tsao Shen, 灶神, or Kitchen-God, is found in every Chinese home. There are many accounts of his origin, none very reliable. Dora gives more than twenty. The *Encyclopedia Sinica*, p. 274, says that his worship dates from Han Wu Ti, 漢武帝, a devotee of Taoism, 133 B. C. He apportions to each member of the family the length of their days, bestows wealth or poverty, and reports to the Pearly Emperor, 玉帝, a Taoist god, the good and bad of the household.

⁷ Chinese houses traditionally face the south, with the kitchen on the east.

⁸ At the present time the great home festival in connection with this god is at the end of the year, usually the 24th of the twelfth month, when he goes to heaven to make his annual report. But the section Yueh Ling of the Book of Rites, which gives a calendar of the ancient religious

observances, says that the sacrifice of summer is that of the furnace, or stove.

⁴ There are several theories as to what is meant by this old phrase, the five sacrifices.

(a) The Book of Rites gives a schedule of five seasons, during each of which sacrifices were made to one of the five plants, Venus, Mercury, Mars, Saturn and Jupiter.

(b) The sacrifices at the gate (with double doors), the road, the door (with one leaf), the kitchen, and the family god.

(c) Those of the stars of longevity, the family god, the gate, the road, and what appears to be a god of evil.

(d) The gate, well, door, kitchen, and family god.

(e) The great Ti 禘 sacrifice, the sacrifices to Heaven and Earth, to ancestors by the emperor and lords, to the God of the Road before making a journey, and thanksgiving sacrifices by the people.

These theories are based upon the references in the ancient ritual books and the Erh Ya, 爾雅.

⁶ In Chinese sacrifices the victims are prepared differently for different divinities, and among the points of distinction is the treatment of the hair and feathers. Sometimes all are removed, sometimes none, and sometimes the hair or feathers are left on certain parts of the bodies.

⁸ This seems to imply food fit for a premier.

⁷ I do not know the meaning of this passage.

⁸ Sui Jen, 燧人, was a mythical emperor of the prehistoric period.

⁹ The 15th of the eighth month is the Mid-Autumn Festival, a national holiday at present, when the moon is worshipped. I do not know what the connection is with the Kitchen-God.

¹⁰ Sung Shan, 嵩山, is the central one of the five Taoist sacred mountains. I do not believe that any western scholar has investigated the cults there. It is in the province of Honan.

¹¹ Each year, shortly after the New Year, a new picture of the Kitchen-God is hung above the kitchen stove, by the chimney. It is taken down when the god goes to make his report.

安青苗文

18. *A Prayer to the God of the Green Sprouts of Rice*¹

We kneel before the tablet of the God of the Rice Sprouts, praying;

O Shen, the controller of the hundred kinds of grain,
And the regulator of rain and season,
Thy virtue fills the space between heaven and earth.
Thou dost care for the grain,
And savest man from calamities.

By thee heat and cold are regulated,
 And we thy servants, men and women,
 Are able to live in hope and happiness.

Now is the fifth month, when the paddy sprouts begin to flourish and the rushes have ripened. We dare to offer thee this small sacrifice, thanking thee for thy blessing and protection. O Shen, let us remain in thy light, and let thy power protect us forever. Mayest thou hear us.

¹ The Chinese have a number of names for rice in its various stages of growth. This prayer is for the young shoots, of the most brilliant green, before they have been separated and transplanted in the flooded fields. I do not know anything about this particular god, but his function is obvious.

牛 王 文

19. *A Prayer to the God of Cattle*

Before the tablet of the God of Cattle, we pray thee, O king.
 Thou art the source of benevolence,
 And dost produce and rear all things.
 With power thou dost ward off great dangers,
 And guard against pestilence.
 It is meet and right for thee
 To receive without end the sacrifices and incense of the district.

Recently the Yin and Yang have had no harmony,¹ and pestilence rages among the cattle. Therefore we offer thee our poor gift, and this humble sacrifice, that evils may be averted and calamities cease. O Shen, pour down thy blessings, and execute thy mission from Heaven by warding off danger and stopping plague. Regulate the Yin and Yang, and grant to the cattle-raisers and farmers peace and prosperity, we beseech thee. For thy protection and blessings we shall always honor thee, and offer thee due sacrifices. In fear and trembling we pray to thee. Mayest thou hear us.

¹ Yin, 陰, and Yang, 陽, are the two principles which underlie and form the universe. Disorder and trouble of all kinds are due to their harmony being disturbed. The terms occur in an appendix to the Book of Changes. See Forke, *World Conception of the Chinese, Yin and Yang*.

架屋謝土神文

20. *A Prayer of Thanksgiving to the Earth-God on the Successful Completion of a Building*

We kneel before the throne of the Earth-God of this district,¹ saying:

The Tao of Heaven likes to give birth,
And the growth of all creatures depends upon it.
The Shen's merits lie in his saving power,
And human relations are protected by thee.
Thou rulest over the earth,
And thy virtue rivals that of Heaven.
Those who are under thy protection
Are grateful to thee.
Though their sacrifice is small,
Their spirit of thankfulness is deep.

We, thy humble worshippers, built a house with several rooms in the . . . month of this year. We were greatly aided by thy gracious help, and the foundation of the house is firm. Therefore we thank thee with sincerity and reverence, and have chosen this beautiful morning to make respectfully this small sacrifice, and reverently burn sticks of incense to the wandering spirits² in thy glory. We are ashamed when we compare ourselves with thy virtue. Our sacrifice is small, yet our gratitude is great. Display thy wisdom and look into our hearts. O Shen, forgive us all that is past, we beseech thee, and protect us. Give us good luck in the days to come. With reverence and sincerity, we, thy servants, pray to thee. Mayest thou hear us.

¹ The Earth-Gods, 土神, are local divinities of the country, having a jurisdiction over a district about ten li in diameter. Their altars are small affairs about ten feet square, and contain crude images of the god and his wife, usually behind a wooden grating. Uncooked meat is offered to them, firecrackers, and poles with a square frame on one end, called Ch'i Kan, 棋杆, which are stuck in the ground beside the shrine. The shrines are called T'u Ti Tsi, 土地祠, or Fu Teh Tsi, 福德祠, and are usually beside a road, though they are also found in towns. The words T'u Ti, 土地, are literally Earth-God. They receive sacrifices upon any unusual occasion within their territory, and especially upon such an operation as the building of a house, which disturbs the earth.

² The wandering spirits are mentioned frequently in the classics, and there have always been altars erected to them. They are the spirits of those who have no descendants to worship and care for them. The Buddhists have identified them with the Hindu Pretas, but the idea existed in China before the advent of Buddhism. See Monier Williams, *Buddhism*, p. 219; Grube, *Religion und Kultus der Chinesen*, p. 182 f.

社公祝文

21. *A Prayer to the God of the Land and Grain* ¹

O Shen, thy achievement is in agriculture,
And thy office is to control the hundred kinds of grain.
Thou art the protector of life
And of ten thousand families within thy territory.
It is right for us to offer thee
Prayers and sacrifices,
That we may express our gratitude to thee,
And be reminded to follow goodness and to guard against evils.

The weather is warm, and the season of planting is here. We owe thee rich sacrifices and dignified rituals. We who eat the hairs of the land ² dare not forget thy grace and protection. Wherefore, on this . . . day, we come together to offer thee this humble sacrifice, beseeching thee to be present in this courtyard.³ We, thy servants, have bathed in thy gracious waves. Grant us perfect bliss and thy everlasting protection. In fear and trembling we pray to thee. Mayest thou enjoy this sacrifice.

¹ The She Chi, 社稷, or Gods of the Land and Grain, are among the oldest of Chinese deities, and are mentioned many times in the classics. Mencius (7, 2, 14) says that these spirits were appointed by the rulers, and when they did not function properly, new incumbents were appointed to their positions. They seem to have been tutelary divinities of the land and of agriculture, and in ancient times everyone, from the ruler down, sacrificed to them. They differed from the Earth-Gods in that a district would have only one She Chi, whereas there might be many Earth-Gods included in it. Apparently they are no longer worshipped, other gods having taken their place. They were usually deified ancestors, and their tablets were taken to war by the feudal princes. Punishments were administered before their tablets. See Chavannes, *Mémoires Historiques*, Vol. I, p. 165, note 1.

² The hairs of the land are the grains.

³ Sacrifices were always made to the She Chi in the open air; in ancient times, on the threshing floors. *Ibid.*

張仙大帝文

22. A Prayer to Chang Hsien, a God of Birth¹

O Shen, thou art the source of straightforwardness and sincerity.

Having given birth to heaven and earth,

Thou dost nourish them;

Being grace and love,

Thou dost fill the world with them.

All the world, both men and beasts, is thine,

For thou art the giver and protector of life.

Dwelling in heaven,

Thou dost manifest thyself by bright spheres;²

Being gracious to men,

Thou sendest them children.

Mid-autumn is here;

The wind, blowing through the cinnamon trees,

Fills the courtyard with a sweet odor.

The moon, as she travels through the waving clouds,

Shines brightly beyond the garden-walls.

We, thy humble worshippers, kneeling before thy mercy-seat, offer thee this sacrifice to show our gratitude and thankfulness. O Shen, the protector of man, send down thy blessings and give children to those who pray for them, that thy unending happiness may be enjoyed by man. We shall give thee thy due oblations. Mayest thou enjoy this sacrifice.

¹ There are two stories about Chang Hsien.

(a) One given by Giles in his *Biographical Dictionary*, p. 323, that a woman named Hua-jui Fu-jen, 花蕊夫人, played a trick upon the first Sung emperor, telling him that a picture of her former husband was that of a god.

(b) A story taken from the works of the Sung author, Su Lao Ch'ien, 蘇老泉, that the god had been a man of the Five Dynasties named Chang Yuan Hsiao, 張遠霄, a native of Mei Shan, 眉山. He traveled on the Ch'ing Ch'eng, 青城, mountain, where he became an immortal. The second story is intended here. *Tz'u Yuan*, Sect. Shen, 寅, p. 230.

² Su Lao Ch'ien dreamed that he saw two shining spheres, which he interpreted as a prophecy of the birth of two sons. The two sons were born, and became two of the most famous of Chinese writers. *Ibid.*

老 郎 文

23. *A Prayer to the Lao Lan* ¹

With the Chi Chang game ²
 We sing and praise you;
 In time of peace
 We play flutes to honor you.

We, your humble servants of the . . . district of . . . respectfully offer you the sacrificial victims, incense, and paper money burned in your glory,³ and reverently kneel before the thrones of T'ien Lao Lan, Tu Lao Lan, and Kao Lao Lan, saying;

O Shen, you make happy report to heaven,
 And understand the harmony of music.
 Your virtue flows out from the moon-palace ⁴
 Even to this day.
 Your mystic teaching was revealed in the pear-garden,⁵
 And your truth is manifested until now.

Spring is here. The grass is like a carpet, and flowers blossom like a curtain. The festival of your holy nativity comes again. O Shen, we praise you; the holy music fills the streets, and men are singing on the roads. All who live need your protection. Give your worshippers grace, and provide for us everlasting joy, we beseech you. And finally we ask that, living under your protection, we may have a golden harvest, and that, dwelling in your light, all may have what they desire. May you enjoy this sacrifice.

¹ The Lao Lan, 老郎, were originally three officials appointed by Ch'in Shih Huang, 秦始皇, 210 B. C., called T'ien, 田, Tu, 竇, and Kao Lao Lan, 郭老郎. The offices were continued under the Han dynasty. I do not know why they have been chosen as the patrons of actors. See Chavannes, *Mém. Hist.*, Vol. 2, p. 201.

² Chi Chang, 聲壤, is the name of an ancient game. An old man is said to have made a song, which he named after the game. *Tz'u Yuan*, Sect. Mao, 卯, p. 147.

³ It is not usual to offer paper-money to gods. It is ordinarily offered to the dead.

⁴ This refers to the story of the visit of T'ang Ming Huang, 唐明皇, circa 740 A. D., to the palace of the moon, 月宮. *Tz'u Yuan*, Sect. Shen, 辰, p. 162.

⁵ T'ang Ming Huang is said to have instructed 300 actors and actresses in the doctrines of Taoism. The meetings took place in a pear-garden, 梨園, of his palace at Ch'ang An, 長安, the modern Hsi An, 西安. See Mayers, *Chinese Reader's Manual*, p. 134.

迎痘神文

24. *A Prayer to Welcome the Goddess of Vaccination*¹

Before the Goddess of Small-Pox we pray, saying;
The virtue of Shang Ti loves to give birth.
Thou, honorable goddess, rulest over vaccination.²
Thou keepest the correct principles;
Thou lovest children.

Because of our love for our children, we beseech thee, O goddess, to send down thy efficacious virus. Today we have cleansed thy altar and welcomed thy imperial carriage. We offer thee pure wine to express our good will; we present this small sacrifice for a slight remembrance. O Shen, send down the five colors of the red cloud,³ and give the heavenly virus to the Ho Yang district. Be merciful to the children and protect them. Deliver them from danger and sickness. Grant good luck to those who dwell in thy glorious light, as they desire. With reverence we pray to thee. Mayest thou hear us.

¹ Small-pox is prevalent in China during the winter and early spring, and is especially virulent among children. The goddess is a benevolent deity, who is besought for protection from the disease. It is the custom to have a service of welcome about the time the epidemic is expected, at which this prayer would be used, and another to send the goddess on her way. The disease is called T'ien Hua, 天花, or Heavenly Flowers.

² I do not know how old the use of serum is in China, but it must have long preceded the knowledge of it in the west. It was put into the nostrils like snuff.

³ Red or pink is associated with the disease for obvious reasons. Besides the red cloud, red apricots or almonds, and red beads are used in referring to the disease.

THE CO-ORDINATE ADVERBIAL CLAUSE IN HEBREW

THEOPHILE JAMES MECK

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

As every Semitic scholar knows, a common construction in Arabic is the so-called *ḥāl*-clause, which, as the name indicates, expresses the state, condition, or manner in which the action of the main clause takes place, but in this paper we are concerned only with its last-named usage. In one of its several forms it follows immediately after the main clause, usually without the interposition of any connective particle, and its verb is finite.¹ It is not to be translated as an independent clause, but as adverbial to the main clause, the whole clause constituting an adverbial accusative; as, for example, in the sentence, "He sat with him joyfully conversing," literally, "he converses (يَتَحَدَّثُ) and he rejoices" (وَيَسْرُحُ). This kind of adverbial clause has not heretofore been recognized in Hebrew, except in its negative form,² but it appears there with great frequency, and is used both with and without the conjunction, just as it is in Arabic. The proof of its existence in Hebrew is to be found in Josh. 11, where the infinitive absolute of verse 11, הִחָרֵם, the more usual construction, appears as a finite verb in verse 12, הִחָרֵם, thus making a co-ordinate adverbial clause. Scholars have universally regarded the latter as incorrect, and all of them, including Ehrlich,³ who is usually so astute on grammatical questions, would reposit the verb as an infinitive absolute. But this is a purely arbitrary emendation and is absolutely unwarranted. The Hebrew writer in these two verses is simply using two different ways of expressing the same idea. In English the two are identical. Verse 11 is to be translated: "They put every person that was in it to the sword, massacring (הִחָרֵם) them, not a living soul being left"⁴;

¹ See, e. g., Wright, *Arabic Grammar*, II, 3, b, c; 8, d, e.

² See, e. g., Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Hebräische Grammatik* ²⁸, § 156, f, g. It seems strange that after recognizing the adverbial clause in its negative form the grammarians did not recognize it as clearly in its affirmative form.

³ *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel*, III, 39.

⁴ The Old Testament translations in this article are taken from the

and verse 12: "So Joshua captured all the cities of those kings, as well as all the kings themselves, and put them to the sword, massacring (הַחֲרִים) them, as Moses, the servant of Yahweh, had commanded"; or if one wished to retain the finite verb of the Hebrew, he could translate: "in that he massacred them," but this is not quite so smooth as the other.

Another evidence of the existence of the co-ordinate adverbial clause in Hebrew is found when we compare the clause, אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיכֶם in Lev. 19:4 and elsewhere, with its variant, כִּי אֲנִי אֱלֹהֶיכֶם e. g. in Lev. 24:22. The former clause is not to be translated as an independent clause, as is universally done, but as a subordinate clause: "I, Yahweh, being your God," or "since I, Yahweh, am your God." Grammatically it is a co-ordinate clause appended to the main clause without any connective particle, but in thought it is subordinate and is to be so translated into English. This too is the evidence of Num. 15:35: "The man must be put to death by having the whole community stone (רָגְמוּ) him outside the camp." The second clause is adverbial to the first; it indicates the manner in which the culprit is to be put to death. Hence the infinitive absolute, רָגֹם, is here used with its regular adverbial force, but rather interestingly the Samaritan, Syriac, and Greek versions have the variant construction, viz. the finite verb, רָגְמוּ. This is not incorrect, as Gray⁵ and others maintain, but is simply another way of expressing the adverbial idea, as is evidenced further by the parallel in Lev. 24:16, where the finite verb (accompanied by the infinitive absolute for emphasis) replaces the infinitive absolute of Num. 15:25: "Whoever blasphemes the name of Yahweh must be put to death, the whole community stoning (רָגְמוּ יְרָגְמוּ) him," or "by having the whole community stone him." Similarly in Gen. 44:12 the finite verbs, הִחַל and כָּלָה, are not to be repointed as infinitive absolute, as many scholars would do,⁶ but the clauses in which they appear are to be taken as adverbial clauses, best reproduced

author's translation in *The Old Testament: An American Translation*, with the exception that "Yahweh" is substituted for "the Lord."

⁵ *Numbers (ICC)*, p. 183.

⁶ E. g. Ball, *The Book of Genesis*, p. 102; Skinner, *Genesis (ICC)*, p. 484; Holzinger, *Genesis*, p. 244; Gunkel, *Genesis*, p. 400.

as participial clauses in English; "beginning with the oldest and ending with the youngest." Again, in Josh. 1:7 it is clear that אֶל-תִּסּוּר מִמֶּנּוּ יָמִין וּשְׂמָאוֹל is not to be translated as an independent sentence, because the clause that follows belongs, not to it, but to the clause preceding it: "Only be very strong and resolute to be careful to do just as my servant Moses commanded you, swerving (אֶל-תִּסּוּר) therefrom neither to the right nor to the left, so that you may succeed in everything that you undertake." From these examples it must be very apparent that the co-ordinate adverbial clause exists in Hebrew, and the verb is found in all its finite forms, perfect, imperfect, and imperative, as illustrated above.

Once the construction is recognized, it is seen to appear very often in the Old Testament, and its accurate reproduction in English makes a translation quite different from the accepted versions, as a few examples will show. Deut. 9:16 is to be translated: "I found that you had indeed sinned against Yahweh your God by making (עֲשִׂיתֶם) yourselves a molten bull, having quickly swerved (סָרַתֶּם) from the path that Yahweh had appointed you." In the last two clauses we have finite verbs, but they are not therefore to be treated as independent clauses but as adverbial, since that is their force. Similarly Josh. 10:9, "So Joshua made a surprise attack upon them by marching (עָלָה) all night from Gilgal"; Josh. 21:45, "Not one of the good promises which Yahweh made to the house of Israel failed, all being fulfilled" (בָּא); Josh. 23:1, "Joshua was old, being well advanced (בָּא) in life"; Exod. 16:18, "When they measured it with an omer, he who had gathered much did not have too much, and he who had gathered little did not have too little, each having gathered (לָקְטוּ) only as much as he could use"; Exod. 21:33 f., "If a man opens a cistern, or if a man digs a cistern and does not cover it, and an ox or an ass falls into it, the owner of the cistern must make restitution by reimbursing (יָשִׁיב) its owner with money, but the carcass is to be his."

In the above examples the subject of the adverbial clause and the main clause has been the same. In many cases the subjects are different, as the following instances will serve to show. In Deut. 12:22 the second clause gives a more precise definition of the thought of the first clause; it is logically subordinate to it, and hence in English the verse ought to be translated: "You are

to eat it just as you would a gazelle or a deer, the unclean and the clean eating (יֹאכְלֵנוּ) it together," i. e. the animal in question is not to be eaten sacramentally. So likewise Deut. 7:6, "For you are a people consecrated to Yahweh your God, Yahweh your God having chosen (בָּחַר) you out of all the peoples that are on the face of the earth to be a people of his very own"; Deut. 7:24, "He will deliver their kings into your power, so that you shall obliterate their very name from under the heavens, not one being able to hold his own (יָחִיצֵב) against you, until you have destroyed them"; Deut. 11:12, "A land for which Yahweh your God cares, the eyes of Yahweh your God being continually on it, from the beginning to the end of the year"; Josh. 21:44, "Not one of all their enemies could withstand them, Yahweh having delivered (נָתַן) all their enemies into their power."

The adverbial clause is ordinarily appended to the main clause without any conjunctive particle, as in all the examples so far listed, but there are instances also of the use of the conjunctive *waw*. A good example is Judg. 2:11 f., "Then the Israelites did what was evil in the sight of Yahweh by serving (וַיַּעֲבֹדוּ) the Baals and forsaking (וַיַּעֲזֹבוּ) Yahweh, the God of their fathers, who had brought them out of the land of Egypt, and by running (וַיָּלֻכוּ) after alien gods from among the gods of the peoples that surrounded them, and by paying homage (וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ) to them, so that they made Yahweh jealous."

These are only a few of the many examples of the adverbial clause that appear in Hebrew, and they could be paralleled by examples from most, if not all the Semitic languages.⁷ To the extent that the translator of the Old Testament fails to recognize them, to that extent he fails to do justice to the Hebrew. They are not to be translated as independent clauses, as is universally done, but as subordinate clauses, since that is their equivalent in English. As all scholars know, Hebrew and the other Semitic languages differ from English in expressing logical subordination ordinarily by grammatical co-ordination, and the co-ordinate adverbial clause is beautifully illustrative of this.

⁷ A good example in Assyrian is Sennacherib, Taylor Prism, Col. II, lines 76 f.: "They offered battle by arraying (*šit-ki-nu*) their forces against me in the neighborhood of Eltekeh." An example in Syriac is Mark 15:24, "When they had crucified him, they parted his garments by casting ܠܘܬܝܗܘܢ = the Greek *βάλλοντες*) lots over them as to what each should take."

"INDEPENDENT" USES OF THE EGYPTIAN QUALITATIVE

T. GEORGE ALLEN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

CERTAIN EGYPTIAN VERB FORMS which Erman almost forty years ago was the first to correlate and group¹ were named by him "pseudo-participles" because on the whole they occurred logically subordinated to qualify or characterize the nouns or pronouns to which they referred. Recognizing them on the one hand as ancestors of the Coptic qualitative, he saw on the other some kinship with the Semitic perfect. This latter aspect led to his classing them apart as the sole survivors of an "older inflection." Gardiner, in his monumental *Egyptian Grammar* issued in 1927, expresses the same point of view in modified terminology, for he calls the tense in question the "old perfective." As the writer has recently suggested,² the term "qualitative," long used for its Coptic stage, appears really suitable for all periods of its career.

The relative antiquity which both Erman and Gardiner assign to this tense, as compared with the forms of the suffix conjugation, has of course impelled search for examples wherein the qualitative may still retain a primitive independence. Erman in his original paper interpreted certain early examples as narrative and assertive. W. Max Müller³ soon showed that ellipsis was responsible for apparently independent uses of the 2d person in greetings. He hesitated also to accept independent uses of the 1st person unparalleled by other persons.

Sethe's fundamental work, *Das aegyptische Verbum*, which followed in 1899, assembles⁴ five supposed examples of the qualitative in *declarative* sentences and two more cases where the qualitative expresses the *result* of a preceding action. All are taken from the Pyramid Texts. Of the five in the first group, Pyr. 395⁵ was in-

¹ *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache*, XXVII, 65-84.

² *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, XLIV, 129.

³ *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache*, XXIX, 98-100.

⁴ In Vol. II, § 3.

⁵ The examples are here cited according to Sethe's standard edition of the Pyramid Texts, published some years later than his *Verbum*.

cluded on the basis of an incorrect reading. Pyr. 839, *w'bt(y)* *w'b k3.k*, translated by Sethe "du bist rein, dein *k3* ist rein,"⁶ appears from the preceding context to urge rather that "because thou art pure, thy *k3* is pure." In Pyr. 1210a, where *mś M.* (same in N) stands in place of *mśyy* (in P), the former is probably passive *śdm.f* and the latter a perf. pass. pt. to be translated: "P. is Kheprer's son who was born in *Htpt*." Pyr. 1434 has *rh M.* (3d per.) parallel to *rhk(wy)* (1st per.), each form being preceded by a reed leaf which probably represents the auxiliary *yw*. The position of the subject in the M text indicates that *rh* is a *śdm.f* form after impersonal *yw*; in the two copies of the P text we have rather *y(w.y) rhk(wy)*, with the qualitative in a normal dependent use after the pronominal subject of the auxiliary, the form of which is suited to a declarative sentence. In Pyr. 1477 *hpr P.*, 3d per. *śdm.f*, is represented by *hprty*, 2d per. qual., in M; but the two versions, P and M, lack complete parallelism here. The M version, including context, would mean: "Have they slain thee? Have they said that thou shouldst die 'at their behest'? (Nay rather) being 'more (truly) existent than they' (*hprty r.sn*) as 'the (most) enduring' of the wild bulls, thou shalt be the foremost of them, alive and 'established in seniority' forever."*

Sethe's two cases of *result* are Pyr. 969bP, (*w*)*d(y).f św mm ntrw* (pl.) *ntrw* (qual.), "he puts him among the gods because (better here than 'so that') he is divine," and Pyr. 1148cP, *śhtp.f ntrwy htpwyy*, "he satisfies the two gods, so that they are satisfied." Even here *htpwyy* refers as usual to the substantive immediately preceding and expresses a state of affairs the origin of which depends on the preceding action. So we may say that the essence of the qualitative is to express a static situation, whether concomitant or not with a related event.

The writer in his article already mentioned has referred to the fact that the qualitative sometimes precedes the main clause, and has cited examples in the 1st and 3d persons.⁷ A case in the 3d

⁶ This example and the use of *qd* and *qdk(w)y* to introduce direct discourse (cf. n. 13) are all that Erman in his *Ägyptische Grammatik*² (§ 331) cites as "completely independent." His 4th edition had not yet appeared when this article was written.

* Half-brackets indicate some hesitancy in the rendering.

⁷ *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, XLIV, 130-31.

fem. sg. occurs in Pyr. 1629a: *Nwt yḥrt(y)*⁸ *ḥr zš.ś ym.k ḥw.ś tḥw*, "Nut being fallen upon her son, even thee, she protects thee." The 2d person is thus used in Pyr. 658a: "Now that thou art become great (*wrt(y)*), O Teti, and art ferried across (*dšt(y)*), thy name is taken up to Osiris." Similar cases, but after instead of before the vocative, occur in Pyr. 945a and 2108a.

Gunn, after an excellent exposition of the pseudo-participle as implying a "resulting state,"⁹ says that *n šḏm.f*, a definitely independent form, is used as its negative correlative! But for illustration he uses *yw.y rhkwy št; n rh.tn št*, "I know it; ye know it not" (Nu 112-13; sim. Westcar 9:1-3), in which, as in one of the examples already cited above, the qualitative is really attached to the subject of an auxiliary verb in the *šḏm.f* form. His only other illustration is *šškw(y) m bšw.f mnḥw, n mh.y ḥr zp n ššt.n.f*, which he translates: "I am versed in his effectual will; I am not unmindful of a detail of what he has ordained" (Urk. IV 363). The first of these clauses is surely parallel in construction with the uncited one before it: *'kkwy ḥr bz.f n zp tpy*. Both may well belong with a main clause preceding them: *yr.n.(y) nn m yb mrr n ytf.y Ymn*. We should then interpret: "I have done this with heart throbbing with love (*mrr*, impf. pt.) toward Amon, for I am initiate in (*'kkwy ḥr*) his primordial mystery and versed in his beneficent will."

Gardiner in his new *Grammar* of Middle Egyptian (p. 246) speaks of the "pseudo-verbal construction without introductory word" as "common in descriptive and narrative passages." Some few of his *descriptive* examples may perhaps be independent, but *narrative* at least should be ruled out. Compare such a combination as that in *Urk.* IV 59-60: *zš.f 'ḥ' m št.f m (ny)-šwt tšwy, ḥkš.n.f ḥr nšt nt wtt šw, šnt.f ḥmt ntr Ḥšt-špswt ḥr yrt mḥrw tš*, "His son being arisen (*'ḥ'*) in his place as king of the Two Lands, he ruled on the throne of him who had begotten him, while his sister, the god's wife Hatshepsut, handled (*ḥr yrt*) the affairs of the land (as regent)." Such diversification in the Egyptian verb forms (qualitative, *n*-form, and *ḥr*+infinitive) deserves a better fate than Gardiner's undifferentiated interpretation as English narrative throughout.

⁸ The prothetic *y* in the N text is interesting; it does not occur in M.

⁹ *Studies*, p. 98; followed by Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar*, p. 238.

The foregoing cases of supposed independence include, besides samples of Middle Egyptian, all the Early Egyptian examples offered in the most outstanding grammatical studies available plus such other early possibilities as the writer had noted down during a complete reading of the Pyramid Texts. For a broader study of Early Egyptian usage, it seemed desirable to recheck the Old Kingdom historical texts also. The writer therefore classified all the qualitatives occurring in *Urkunden* I. The types found include:

1. Circumstantial clauses introduced by *šk* + obj. pronoun.¹⁰
2. Clauses in indirect discourse introduced by *wnt* and *nt(y)t*.¹¹
3. Clauses (all in the 1st per. sing.) introduced by the auxiliary *yw(y)*.¹²
4. The form *ḏḏ* following its logical subject to introduce direct discourse.¹³
5. Epithets attached to kings' names.¹⁴

¹⁰ *Urk.* I 8: 15, 17; 9: 5, 15; 11: 8; 15: 17; 21: 14; 26: 16; 29: 2 (*šk* + obj. pron. + prep. phrase + qual.); 34: 6; 39: 12. Cf. *AJSL*, XLIV, 119 and 129. In *Urk.* I 18: 11 (partly restored) and 149: 10 *šk* is followed instead by the *šdm.f* form, and in 134: 16 by the *n*-form.

¹¹ *Urk.* I 128: 8, *wnt.k h3t(y)*, and 136: 11, *nt(y)t w(y) prk(wy)*. On the pronouns cf. *AJSL*, XLIV, 119-20.

¹² *Urk.* I 87: 17; 88: 1 and 2; 90: 1; 116: 9; 126: 2; 140: 17; 141: 2. With *yw(y) rhk(wy)*, "I know," in 88, 90, and 116, cf. *yw rh.n.(y)*, "I 'have learned'," in 143: 2 and perhaps the same (much restored) but without *yw* in 89: 17.

¹³ *Urk.* I 35: 10 (after *Ppy*, fem.); 38: 7; 90: 11; 140: 16; 145: 16; 147: 8; 150: 15; 152: 1. On possible interpretation of *ḏḏ* as a participle see *AJSL*, XLIV, 127-28. The 1st per. qual. *ḏḏk(w)y* occurs in Middle Egyptian (*Sinuhe* B 45 and 114) to introduce responses. But our *ḏḏ* involves only one speaker, not the second part of a dialogue.

¹⁴ *nh ḏt* (Teti earliest), *Urk.* I 82: 3; 83: 7; 93: 6; 97: 13, 17; 105: 12; 109: 10; 112: 16; 115: 11; 118: 15; 130: 5; 146: 7; *nh ḏt my R*, *ibid.* 112: 17 (Pepi II); *nh ḏt r nhh*, *ibid.* 128: 13 (Pepi II); *nh* + ? (broken), *ibid.* 142: 9 (Pepi II); *nh my R*, *ibid.* 94: 17 (Pepi I); 111: 6 (Mernere); *nh my R ḏt*, *ibid.* 114: 6 (Pepi II); *dy nh*, *ibid.* 115: 8 (Pepi II); *dy nh my R*, *ibid.* 115: 7 (Pepi II); *dy nh ḏt*, *ibid.* 94: 16; 95: 15; 97: 10 (all Pepi I); *dy nh nb ḏt*, *ibid.* 91: 4 (Pepi I); *dy nh w3s ḏt*, *ibid.* 97: 10 (Pepi I); *dy nh ḏḏ w3s*, *ibid.* 114: 13 (Pepi II); *dy nh ḏḏ w3s ḏt*, *ibid.* 97: 4 (Pepi I). Cf. *AJSL*, XLIV, 129-30. Since the 'conical loaf' is an ideogram for "give" (cf. Gardiner, *Eg. Grammar*, p. 517), its tentative transliteration as *dy* has no bearing on the grammatical interpretation

6. Clauses unquestionably circumstantial.¹⁵
7. Clauses previously accepted as independent.¹⁶
8. Proper names.¹⁷
9. Uncertain passages.¹⁸

Of the above types, Nos. 1-3 are attached in all cases to a preceding pronoun and seem in themselves dependent. But Nos. 1 and 2 form dependent, and No. 3 independent,¹⁹ complexes; the keynote is struck by the introductory word. Nos. 4 and 5 are attached unanimously to preceding nouns, while No. 6 combines adjectival and adverbial aspects.

The cases under No. 7 require closer study. A reason seems given in 84:4 and 149:4. With 86:5 the preceding context is lost, but the situation is similar to that in 104:9: "His majesty sent me" to undertake certain projects, "and (of course) I acted

of the form. The group *nh wd3 snb* is not used of kings in *Urk.* I; but it does occur, unabbreviated, in 130:2 and 17, to describe the desired condition of the dwarf brought to King Pepi II.

¹⁵ Breasted, *Ancient Records*, I, translates the following cases as circumstantial (the § nos. in parentheses refer to that volume): *Urk.* I 18:15 (§ 211); 65:5 (§ 274); 108:6 (§ 323); 110:14 (§ 317); 111:8 (§ 318); 124:17 (§ 334); 125:16 (§ 335; but read "gone" for "going"); 127:14 (§ 336); 129:5 (§ 352); 130:2, 17 (§ 353); 144:15 (§ 379); 146:13 (§ 382); 148:17 (§ 389). Only 124:17 and 129:5 apply to pronouns, the rest to nouns. Another clear case, but not in Breasted, is 72:13. Choice between a participle or other adjectival form and a circumstantial qualitative may exist in some of the following: 104:3 (*33t*); 113:4 (*h3bt*); 117:4 (*[t]m[t]*); 133:16 (*33w w3rw*); 134:8 (*nhw*).

¹⁶ Breasted references are added as above. The cases are: *Urk.* I 84:4 (§ 286); 86:5 (§ 290); 99:10 (§ 308); 100:9, 11 (§ 309); 102:17 (§ 312); 104:9 (§ 314); 104:14 (§ 315); 106:4, 11 (§ 320); 108:1, 4 (§ 323); 109:4, 5 (§ 324); 137:7 (§ 369); 137:14 (§ 370); 139:3, 5 (§ 372); 149:4 (§ 390).

¹⁷ This list retains the written order of elements in the names. They are: *Mwt-htpt(y)-hr.š*, fem., 35:9; *Yy-htp*, masc., 102:17; *Pypy-nht*, masc., 132:1, 6, 8, 13; *Pypy mn nfr*, pyr., 97:5, 131:17; *Nfr-k3-R: mn nh*, pyr., 113:1, 117:17, 131:15, 132:11, 140:10; *Mryy-R: mn nfr*, pyr., 113:2, 117:13, 15; *Mr(yw).n-R: h: nfr*, pyr., 117:14, 132:2.

¹⁸ *Urk.* I 115:2 (*nh3ty*)? But *ty* is probably an ancient error for *w3š*; 126:17 (*h3?* End lost); 136:3 (*mn?* Context lost); 136:17 (*rdyk(wy)?* The *k* may be an *n*).

¹⁹ As far as *Urk.* I seems concerned. This is a change from the opinion expressed in *AJSL*, XLIV, 130.

(*yrk(wy)*)" so capably as to win his praise. In 106:4 and 11 a reason and a circumstance seem given, but the situation is complicated by parenthetical remarks just before them in the Egyptian. With the preceding context we may translate the former: "His majesty praised me for my zeal . . . more than any (other) official of his . . . (and never had this office been filled by any (other) servant previously), for I was filling (*yrk(wy)*) for him (the office) . . . acceptably . . ." Similarly in line 11: "I performed 'what-ever official duty needed to be performed' . . . (and never had the like been done . . . previously), acting (*yrk(wy)*) altogether so that his majesty praised me for it." The situation in 100:9 and 11 is likewise circumstantial or resultant: "I supplanted the four 'superintendents of the palace grounds' who had been in office, acting (*yrk(wy)*) (as a foregone conclusion) to his majesty's satisfaction . . . , acting (*yrk(wy)*) altogether so that his majesty praised me . . ." In 102:17 we hear of Uni's capable leadership of the troops "so that not a man of them took a goat from anybody while I was conducting them (*m³k(wy) šn*) . . ." A resultant situation and a circumstance appear in 108:1 and 4: "His majesty sent me to Hatnub to fetch a large offering-table . . . , and (of course) I shipped (*šh³k(wy)*) this offering-table to him in only seventeen days . . . in this (next described) cargo-boat, having hewed (*š³k(wy)*) for it a cargo-boat of acacia . . ." ²⁰ Circumstantial uses in 109:4 and 5 are complicated by an ellipsis: "I did the whole in only one year, (the boats previously mentioned) being (by then) launched and laden (*mḥ* and *ṣṭp*) . . ."

In the remaining cases under No. 7 (99:10; 104:14; 137:7, 14; 139:3, 5) the qualitative precedes the main clause. We may translate: "I having petitioned (or, 'upon my petitioning'; [*d]bhk(wy)*) . . . , his majesty caused . . ."; "When it was said that there were revolvers . . . , having crossed over (*ḏ³k(wy)*) in transports . . . I landed . . ."; etc. The verb *h³k(wy)* in 137:14 seems to be resumptive of that in line 7: "On getting downstream to Wawat . . . , while . . . — on getting downstream I informed . . ."

Proper names which may contain qualitatives (group No. 8)

²⁰ That is, Sethe's suggested rearrangement of the text may be unnecessary; but cf. n. 27.

include names of individuals and names of royal pyramids. Breasted's translation²¹ shows that he interprets all the latter as written with king's name + a *šdm.f* form to be read before king's name (or a qualitative to be read where it stands?) + a (second?) qualitative. But it may be simpler to interpret the last element as a noun subject preceded by its *šdm.f* verb. These pyramid names would then mean: "The beauty of Pepi abides," etc. One of the personal names, *Mwt-ḥtp(y)-ḥr.š*, fem., certainly includes a qualitative. This is paralleled in the masc. by such other Old Kingdom examples as *Pth-nḥw* and *Ḥr-wry*, with the qualitative endings written.²² *Pypy-nḥt* is probably of the same type. In *Yy-ḥtp*, on the other hand, *ḥtp* is probably a participle serving as subject of *yy*. Compare such masc. names as *Yy-mryy* and *Yy-nfr*, contrasting with the fem. names *Yy-mryyt* and *Yy-nfryt*, also the name *Yy-šn.f*, "his brother comes."²³ The question still remains whether, like these last, names containing qualitatives form complete sentences. They probably do, in view of the residual cases of apparently independent "pseudo-verbal" descriptive clauses in Middle Egyptian (see above) and of such apparently nominal or pseudo-verbal sentence names as *Ynpw-m-nḥ*²⁴ and *Šbk-ḥr-ḥb*.²⁵ But it should also be remembered that, at least later, names of deities do occasionally occur as names of individuals, sometimes alone and sometimes accompanied by epithets.²⁶ So it is barely conceivable that both the qualitatives and the prepositional phrases in names should be thought of attributively instead of as predicates.

The uncertain texts (group No. 9) cannot help us. Summing up, then, the results of our study, practically every occurrence of the qualitative in Early Egyptian, outside of proper names, seems to picture the background, the outgrowth, or an attendant circumstance of some associated main event. The relative chronology of

²¹ *Ancient Records*, Index, p. 154.

²² Cairo 1558 and 1566, respectively, cited in Hoffmann, *Die theophoren Personennamen*, pp. 1 and 5.

²³ Examples from Murray, *Index of Names and Titles of the Old Kingdom*.

²⁴ *Urk.* I 2-3, 3d dyn.

²⁵ Breasted, *Ancient Records*, I, §§ 725-27, 12th dyn.

²⁶ Cf. alone Isis, mother of Thutmose III; Isis, queen of Ramses III; Suti and Hor, 18th dyn. architects; Hor of Heracleopolis, 26th dyn. Divine names plus epithets include Harsiese ("Horus, son of Isis"), 21st dyn. ff., and Harpeson ("Horus, the brother"), 22d dyn.

state and action corresponds normally to the position of the respective clauses; that is, to express a preceding phase, the qualitative precedes the main clause, while an accompanying or succeeding phase follows the main clause.²⁷ Gardiner²⁸ is clearly right in saying that the qualitative is "static, passive, and expressive of *condition*." The aim of this paper has been to point out in more detail than has heretofore been done how extremely rare in practice the occurrence of a qualification completely dissociated from an action may be.

²⁷ The only exception in *Urk.* I is 108: 4, where Sethe has already suggested a change of order; but cf. n. 20.

²⁸ *Egyptian Grammar*, p. 244.

A HEBRAEO-SUFIC POEM

HARTWIG HIRSCHFELD

LONDON

MOHAMMEDAN SUFISM and Judaism are by their nature far apart. Yet there exists evidence of the early encroachment of the former on the latter. A specimen of this was published by me in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* in 1920, and there are others still unpublished in the hoards of the Cairo Genizah fragments in the Cambridge University Library. One of them consisting of two leaves in Arabic, written in Hebrew square characters, forms the subject of the following pages. It is a poem written like an ordinary prose piece, and headed: *Says the Imām, the Philosopher, Abu Mohammed*.¹ The poem is incomplete, the last four lines being missing. This we gather from another but complete copy which is found at the end of a MS. volume at the British Museum.² This poem, together with some others, originally formed part of a special pamphlet, as can be seen from the fact that the first page remained blank. This copy of the poem is written in Arabic characters in the ordinary form of Arabic poetry. It has no heading, but the writer added occasional vowel signs. The metre is *ramal*.

A palaeographic comparison of the two copies shows that the Hebrew one is much the older of the two, revealing a style of writing not later than the thirteenth century, whereas the other, to judge from the paper and the script, cannot be older than the sixteenth century. I have been unable to trace any other copy, although it doubtless existed or exists somewhere. There is even a probability that it was printed in some Eastern publication inaccessible to me. In any case several discrepancies in both texts show that they were taken from different originals.

The heading mentioned above gives no sure clue as to the author. A philosopher of the name of Abu Mohammed, who became so popular among Jews that one of them copied his poem, even adding to his name the formula for deceased pious Moslems, is not men-

¹ FS. 8Ka6⁴.

² Add. 7596 fol. 251ro among *Carmina quaedam in laude Mohammed*, but not further described.

tioned in any work of Arabic bibliography, ancient or modern. It is, however, probable that the copyist had in his mind the famous *Abu Hāmid Mohammed al Ghazālī* who died in 1111, and the alteration of his name is simply due to carelessness. In mediæval Jewish works on philosophy he is frequently quoted as *Abu Hāmid*. His anti-Aristotelian and mystical writings were eagerly studied by Jews, and traces of them are to be found in Bahya b. Baqudah's "Duties of the Hearts," and Judah Hallevi's *Kitāb al-Khazari*. Several of his works were even translated into Hebrew.

The poem gives in a nutshell a complete summary of the tenets of pantheistic Sufism. Its poetic value is nil, and the lapses from correct prosody are many. The language, on the other hand, is classical Arabic, except for occasional instances of vulgar spelling. The writer of the Hebrew fragment seems to have revised his work, as is shown by occasional corrections.

The second leaf begins in the middle of a sentence, thus showing that it originally belonged to a larger work. It is unfortunately in such bad condition, with holes and effaced letters, that for the present it is useless for literary treatment. One paragraph is headed באב אלהרי פממאתה מחיאה "Chapter on Guidance, his death is his revival. . . ."

A

فبكونی ورثونی خَرْنَا
 ام على الحاضر معكم هاهنا
 ليس ذاك الميت والله انا
 كان جسمي وقميصي زمنا
 طُرْتُ عنه وتخلي رهنا
 من تراب قد تخلي للفنا
 كا[ن] سجنى فألفت السجنا
 وبنا لى فى المعالى وطنا
 فحييت وخلعت الكفنا
 وار[ا] الله جهارا علنا
 كلما ياتى بعيدا او دنا
 وهو رمزى فافهموا حسنا
 لا ولا ماء ولكن لبنا
 كان سرى فطرة فطرنا
 ودعوا الطلسم ياتى وسنا
 أى معنا تحت لفظ كمننا
 ودعوا الكل ففينا ينشنا
 هى الآ ثقله من هاهنا
 هو حياتا وهو غايات المنا
 تشهد الحق جهارا علنا
 فاذا ما مات طار الوسنا
 يشكر السعى ويأتى بالمنا
 ليس بالعاقل منا من ونا
 اعتقادى انكم انتم انا
 وكذا الاجسام جسم عننا
 ومتى ما كان شرا فبنا
 واعلموا انكموا فى اثرنا
 وسلام يتبدى وثنا
 رحم الله صديقا منا

قل لاخوان راؤنى ميتا
 أعلى الغائب متى حزنكم
 انظرون ياتى ميتكم
 أنا فى الصّور وهذا جسدى
 5 أنا درّ قد حوانى صدف
 أنا كنز وحجابى طلسم
 أنا عصفور وهذا [قفصى]
 أشكر الله الذى خلصنى
 كنت قبل اليوم ميتا بينكم
 10 وأنا اليوم أناجى ملاء
 عاكفا فى الوُج اقرى وأرى
 وطعامى وشرابى واحد
 ليس خمرا سائغا او عسلا
 هو مشروب رسول الله اذ
 15 واهدموا البيت واخلوا قفصى
 فافهموا السرّ فيه نباء
 وقميصى مزقوه زمنا
 لم ترعكم هجمة الموت فما
 انظنوا الموت موتا بينكم
 20 فاخلص الاجسام عن انفسكم
 حتى هذا الدار الانائم
 فاحسن الظن برّب راحم
 وخذبوا لالواد جد الانترا
 ما ارى نفسى الا انتم
 25 عنصر الانفس منا واحدا
 فمتى ما كان خيرا فلنا
 فارحمونى ترحموا انفسكم
 فلكم متى سلام طيّب
 اسال الله لنفسى رحمة

B

קאל אלאמאם אלפילסוף אבו מחמד רצי אללה ענה

- | | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|----|
| פבכוני ורתוני חונא | קל לאכון ראוני מיתא | |
| ליס דאך אלמית ואללה אנא | אתטנן באני מיתכם | |
| כאן ביתי וקמיצי זמנא | אנא פי אלצור והדא גסדי | |
| מן תראב פתהנא ללפנא | אנא כנו וחנאבי מלסם | |
| כאן סגני פאלפת אלסגנא | אנא דר' קד הואני צדף | 5 |
| טרת ענה ותרלי ואנא | אנא עצפור והדא קפצי | |
| ובנא לי פי אלמעאלי וטנא | אשכר אללה אלדי כלצני | |
| פתתריית וכלעת אלכפנא | כנת קבל אליום מיתא בינכם | |
| וארי אללה נהארא עלנא | פאנא אליום אנאני מלא | |
| (כל) מא כאן ויאתי ודנא | עאכפא פי אללוח אקרי פארי | |
| הו רמזי פאפהמוה חסנא | וטעאמי ושרבי ואחד | 10 |
| לא ולא מא ולכן לבנא | ליס כמרא סיאנא ולא עסלא | |
| כאן יסרי פטרה פטנא | הו משרוב רסול אללה אד | |
| א' מעני תחת לפט כמנא | פאפהמוא אלסר נביא | |
| ודרו אלטלסם יחכי וחנא | פהרמו ביתי ורצו קפצי | |
| ודרוא אלכל דפינא ותנא | ותיאבי מוקוהא רממא | 15 |
| לסת ארצא דארכם לי וטנא | קד תרחלת וכלפתכם | |
| פאדא מאתא טאר אלוסנא | הו אלדאר בנוס מגרק | |
| לחיאית הי גאיאת אלמנא | לא תטנא אלמות מותא אנה | |
| תבצרוא אלחק גהארא עלנא | אכלעו אלאגסאר ען אנפסכם | |
| הי אל'א אנתקאלא מן הנא | לא תרעכם סכרה אלמות פמא | 20 |
| ליס באלעאקל מנא מן ונא | גרו פי אלדניא בעקל לא תנוא | |
| תשכרו אלסעי ותאחוא אמנא | ואחסנוא אלטן ברב ראחם | |
| תקאדי אנכם אנתם אנא | מא ארי נפסי אלא אנתםו אע | |
| כרא אלאגסאם גסם עמנא | ענצר אלאנפס מנא ואחר | |
| ומחי מא כאן שר פבנא | פמתי מא כאן כיר פלנא | 25 |

TRANSLATION

Says the Imām, the Philosopher, Abu Mohammed.

1. Speak to brethren who saw me dead, and wept grievously for me.
2. Is your mourning on account of my absence from you, or because I am present ³ with you here?
3. Do you fancy that I am your dead one? This is not a corpse, but I am God.
4. I am present in [all] forms, and this my body was my house and my garment for a time.
5. I am a pearl hidden in a shell, I flew away from it, departing for ever.
6. I am a treasure, and my screen is a talisman of dust leading to decay.
7. I am a sparrow, and this my cage.⁵ I liked the prison.
8. I thank God who set me free and built a place for me on high.
9. Before this day I was dead amongst you, but I re-appeared, having broken my coffin.
10. I whisper to-day to the [heavenly] Court, and see ⁴ God as in open daylight.
11. Sojourning in the Firmament, and I behold all that comes from far or near.⁵
12. My food and my drink is the same; this is a metaphor of mine; understand it well.
13. It is not limpid ⁶ wine, or honey, no, nor water, but milk.^{7*}
14. It was the drink of the Messenger of Allah when he travelled at night, and made (us) break the fast.
15. They destroyed the house, and made my cage empty, and called the talisman to come and flash.⁷
16. Understand ye the secret, for there is in it the prophecy of any meaning that is hidden in it.

³ A line 2 الحاضر ; the line is missing in B.

⁴ A وار .

⁵ B لا missing in B.

⁶ B line 11 نبيذ, but probably نبيذ preserved. See the Diwān of Ḥassān b. Thābit, ed. Hirschfeld XIII, l. 17 and schol.

⁷ So according to A, l. 14; B and scattered.

^{7*} See Ibn Hishām, p. 375.

17. They tore my garment to tatters,⁸ and scattered the whole of it, a buried fetish.⁹
18. Let not the assault of death frighten you, it is only a removal from here.
19. Do you mean that death is death? It is life and the goal of fate.
20. Release ye the bodies from your souls,¹⁰ they¹¹ witness the truth openly and manifestly.
21. He who lives in this abode is but asleep; when he dies sleep flies away.¹²
22. Have the best thought about a merciful Lord; give thanks for the journey while fate comes.
23. Take good desire as provision; none of us is not wise who is weak.¹³
24. I see not myself, but you, and it is my belief that you are I.
25. The essence of your souls is one, and the bodies are those of our ancestors.
26. When it is good it is for us, and when evil it is in us.
27. So love ye me, you love yourselves, and know ye that we are on our way.
28. Good greeting for ye from us, a greeting plain and oft.
29. I ask the mercy of God for my soul; may He have mercy on any friend of ours.

⁸ A *זמנא*; but B better *וממא* and *והיאכי*.

⁹ A not clear and probably corrupt. It appears that *ففيها* might be wrongly transcribed from *רפינא* (دفيها).

¹⁰ B *he has purified the bodies*.

¹¹ B *חבצרו*.

¹² B *he causes sleep to fly away*.

¹³ B l. 21; *גדן* probably wrongly transcribed from *خذوا*.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Iranian Studies. By CURSETJI ERACHJI PAVRY. Bombay: CAPTAIN PRINTING WORKS, 1927. Pp. xxii + 239. Price Rs. 10-.

Unfortunately, most of those who are interested in Zoroaster and things Zoroastrian, whether their particular angle of interest be religious or linguistic, are prevented, by the barrier of language, from following closely the interesting progress now being made in Parsi scholarship. Many Parsis write only in Gujarati, especially those of the older generation. Of the latter, one, whose work has, so far, been inaccessible to persons ignorant of Gujarati, is Dastur Cursetji Pavry, chief priest of the Navsari community, and the author of a number of books on Zoroastrian subjects. The first of these to be published in English is the present volume of *Iranian Studies*, translated by two Parsi scholars, P. A. Wadya and D. M. Madan, with an Introduction by a third, G. K. Nariman, at whose suggestion the translation was made.

The title of the book is somewhat misleading; "*Zoroastrian Studies*" would have been more suggestive of its content. The Dastur's purpose is to describe the origin of certain religious customs and ceremonies prevalent among present-day Zoroastrians, to compare the modern observance with the original, and to approve or condemn the former, according as it seems to be an improvement, or otherwise, upon the latter. The author is described in the Introduction as occupying "a position midway between the purblind orthodox and the extreme wing of radical reformers among the Parsis." Frankly he takes to task those of his coreligionists who cling obstinately to traditional observances and ceremonies, those who will not accept the results of modern research. Most of the facts presented in the book are already more or less familiar to Avestan scholars. Its main interest lies in its spirit, in its author's effort to give a critical and scholarly opinion, an effort conspicuously lacking in many Parsi writers of partisan attitude.

The eleven chapters of the *Studies* deal with such topics as the Atash-Behram, or fire-temple, the Dakhma, or tower of silence, the temple of the Yazads, known as the Daremeher, the astronomy and chronology of the Avesta, the wonders of Jamshid's reign, and certain points of ceremonial and ritual. The discussion of the

Atash-Behram is typical. Although the fire and the site of the fire had been held in reverence from the earliest times, the Atash-Behram proper, now a purely religious emblem, dates only from the Sassanian period. It was, as its name implies (cf. Av. *ātar*—"fire," *varəθraγna*—"victory"), originally founded to celebrate a military victory or other great political event, and signified the union of government and religion. Since its establishment is of comparatively recent date, no directions are given in the Avesta as to the manner of conducting the ceremony. Fargard 8 of the Vendidad does, however, give directions for collecting and preserving sixteen different kinds of fire which could be put to non-Zoroastrian uses, and also for purifying fire which had been defiled by contact with a dead body. Nothing is known about the founding of the first Atash-Behram in India, after the fall of the Sassanian dynasty and the emigration of the Parsis to Gujarat, but it is known that in 1580 A. D., the Persian dasturs sent to the Indian dasturs, at the request of the latter, directions for founding an Atash-Behram, which were based on the passage in the eighth Fargard of the Vendidad. Many changes had, however, been made in the latter. Instead of sixteen fires there were now seventeen kinds to be collected, and all were to be purified. Ceremonies prescribed by the Vendidad to be repeated nine times were now to be performed ninety-one times; while ninety-one Yasnas and Vendidads were to be recited. In the three centuries or more which have elapsed since these directions were received from Persia, so many changes and additions have been made that the number of fires necessary for the founding of an Atash-Behram is now over a thousand, and the number of Yasnas and Vendidads which have to be recited is about seventy-five thousand, with a corresponding increase in accompanying ceremonies. In concluding his account of the development of the fire-enthronement ceremonies, and in appealing for a return to the simpler and more authentic observances, the author says (p. 35): "Changes in ceremonials and customs in response to changes in time, place, and circumstances, are neither good nor bad in themselves. But they must not be introduced without proper reason, and must be grounded in spirit of the religion. We have already noticed however that in the matter of ceremonials we have entirely departed from the spirit of the injunctions in the Vendidad, and have added so enormously to their number and na-

ture as to make them difficult, if not impossible, to carry out. What is more, we are running the danger of diminishing the communal devotion toward ceremonials by making them expensive and difficult of being performed; and we would especially draw to this danger the attention of all those who are constantly preaching to us to preserve intact all the prayers and ceremonials as we find them to-day."

As for the form of the book, the reader's attention is constantly distracted and his patience tried by the countless mistakes in spelling and word-division. The list of Errata, pp. xxi-xxii, includes only a fraction of such errors. More serious are the numerous inaccuracies and inconsistencies in the spelling of proper names and of technical terms. Eight different spellings of Atash-Behram are used. The *Alburz*, *Alborz*, and *Alburj* mountains are mentioned, several times each. On p. 24 we find *Rivayat*, on p. 43 *Revayat*. We read of the *Regveda* on p. 136, and of the *Riga-Veda* on p. 138. *Ipsi dixits* on p. 24 is a peculiar combination. A prehistoric ruler of Iran is called *Faredoon* on p. 138, *Faredun* on p. 146, *Faridoon* on p. 150. On p. 107, *Semitic* is misused for *Semite*. The second passage from the *Gathas*, quoted on p. 171, <Y. 46. 1>, when compared with Geldner's standard text, is found to contain six mistakes of various kinds.

One could continue almost indefinitely to enumerate similar examples of carelessness. Since the book is a translation, the author is probably the only person connected with its publication who is in no way to blame for the slovenly way in which the printing and proof-reading appear to have been done. In a recent general survey, made for a very different purpose, of Parsi publications in English, the reviewer was struck by the fact that a similar condition prevails among most of the Parsi books printed in English in India. Those who are trying to advance Parsi scholarship and to earn for it a place of respect in the world at large, will more easily and quickly attain their object if they insist on the elimination of such mistakes as disfigure the present volume.

MARIA WILKINS SMITH.

Temple University.

L'Inde et le monde. Par SYLVAIN LÉVI. Paris: CHAMPION, 1926. Pp. 177.

Ancient Indian Tribes. By BIMALA CHURN LAW. (Punjab Oriental Series, No. 12.) Lahore: PUNJAB SANSKRIT BOOK DEPOT, 1926. Pp. vi + 192 + 4.

Die Arische Feuerlehre. By JOHANNES HERTEL. I Teil. (Indo-iranische Quellen und Forschungen, Heft VI.) Leipzig: H. HAESSEL, 1925. Pp. 188.

Die Methode der Arischen Forschung. By JOHANNES HERTEL. (Indo-iranische Quellen und Forschungen, Beiheft zu Heft VI.) Leipzig: H. HAESSEL, 1926. Pp. 80.

L'Inde et le Monde, by Professor Sylvain Lévi, is a collection of six essays or addresses of popular character but of considerable philosophic interest. The first, which gives this book its title, stresses the fact that India is not so isolated as is often said; the next, "Humanisme bouddhique," points out that Buddhism is to the East what Christianity is to the West; "Civilisation brahmanique" and the following "Civilisation bouddhique" reveal how the fundamental Brahmanic tenets, Soul, Karma, salvation, castes, form a unity as expressions of one view of life; "Orient et Occident" shows the difficulty in mutual understanding; it is well-nigh impossible for the Occident to understand the Orient; the final essay is an address in English on "Eastern Humanism," which is a contradiction in terms since only the West has the intellectual catholicity of real humanism; India's aloofness is not humanistic.

The second booklet, *Ancient Indian Tribes*, by B. C. Law, contains all that is mentioned in ancient literature regarding the five tribes of Kāśis, Kośalas, Assakas, Magadhas, and Bhojas, a useful collection, though including many trivial details culled from fables.

Buddha said "all is burning" and such seems to be the belief of Johannes Hertel, who has turned from the Pāñcatantra to explain the Veda in terms of fire-worship. In the first booklet, the author follows up his theory (*IF* xli) regarding *brāhman*; *dhénā* is "light"; *yaj* means "turn into fire"; *saośyant* means "he who will turn into fire"; *śávas* is "light"; *yakṣin* is "he who has light"; *vasu* and derivatives are all light (compare *Vohu Manah*

as "clear thinking"); *vánaspáti* is fire as lord of wood, etc., important if true. The second booklet tries to show that all Indic-Iranic religion is based on fire-cult; it cites ridiculous attempts to translate the Rig Veda owing to ignorance of Hertel's theory; Mithra-cult is found in RV 10. 22. There is also a sarcastic polemic against Clemen, Keith, and Charpentier, who are civilly told that they "misrepresent facts, have not the most elementary knowledge of historical grammar, and are incapable of considering facts before setting up a theory" (p. 56). Altogether, a fiery little book.

E. WASHBURN HOPKINS.

Yale University.

American Schools of Oriental Research. Publications of the Baghdad School. Texts: Vol. I. Joint expedition with the Irak Museum at Nuzi, by EDWARD CHIERA. Paris: Geuthner, 1927.

This volume, the first one of a series in which Professor Chiera will publish and elucidate the tablets which he excavated in 1925 at Yorghana Tepe (near Kirkuk), the ancient Nuzi, contains the cuneiform text of one hundred inheritance texts. The copies are made with the accuracy and clearness that characterize Chiera's transcriptions. The tablets represent the records of a Hurri family living probably, according to Chiera, about the middle of the second millennium B. C. It is perfectly evident from the spelling of the Assyrian, from the obscure foreign words contained in these texts, and especially from the character of the proper names (in which the divine name Teshub is of frequent occurrence), that the vernacular was not Assyrian but some form of Hittite.

Although all the documents are contracts of adoption, only No. 59 (transliterated and translated by Chiera and Speiser in *JAOS.*, 47, 40 f.) represents a *bona fide* actual adoption. In the other tablets adoption is a legal fiction for a sale of real estate or (26, 50, and 78) of a woman into slavery. No. 26 reads as follows: "Tablet of daughtership and brideship of Tehiptilla, the son of Puhishenni. Iuki, the son of Mazian, gives his daughter Shiluya for daughtership and brideship to Tehiptilla. And Tehiptilla gives her as wife to Akip-sharri his slave. And if Akip-sharri dies,

Tehiptilla will give Shiluya to another slave of his. And as long as Shiluya lives, she shall not leave the house of Tehiptilla. And Tehiptilla gives to Iuki 45 SU of silver." No. 50 is likewise a *ṭuppi mârûtî u kallâtûti*; No. 78 is a *ṭuppi ahâtûti* (tablet of sisterhood) and contains the record of a similar transaction.

With the exception of these four tablets (26, 50, 59, and 78) and of 87 and 99, all other texts are *ṭuppi mârûti* (tablet of sonship): 87 and 99 are *ṭuppi ahûti* (tablet of brotherhood). The adoption of a person as a son, as a daughter (82, where *mârûti* is used instead of *mârûtî*, daughtership), or as a brother (87, 99), represents merely the sale of some real estate. The buyer, in consideration of a payment in silver, bronze, grains, or the like, was adopted by the seller and, upon the death of the latter, came into possession of a specified field, or orchard, or house. The contract, after the title (which is lacking only in 6 and 82), enumerates the following items, with the omissions and the changes in order classified below.

A. A description of the real estate given to the "adopted son" as his portion (*zittu*).

B. The amount paid by the buyer (*kîštu*).

C. The provision that the real estate must be cleared of any encumbrance resting upon it (*pakîranu*, *dînu*, or *perku*, abbreviated below respectively C, Cd, Cp).

D. The provision that the seller will bear the public charges of the land (*ilku*, cf. my study of this word in *AJSL* 39, 66 ff).¹

E. The amount to be paid by the seller if he refuses to carry out the transaction (*balakutu*).

There is a considerable variety of order and omissions in these tablets, as the following table will show.

1) *Five items.*

ABCDE: 4 9 13 22 30 31 34 38 41 45 54 57 91 93 98.
ABCpDE: 83 85.

ABCD: 25 28 33 40 49. ABCdED: 23 36 43 67.

ABDCE: 3 12 27 37 46 48 52 55 92. ABDCpE: 62.

2) *Four items.*

ABCE: 15 20 56 58(?) 63 66(?) 68 77 88 94 100. ABCdE:
5 16 21 51 70 71 73 74 76 81 96. ABCpE: 29 86 87 89.

¹ The vernacular word for *ilku* seems to have been *irwiš* (written IR. PI. IŠ: 28, 24 and 33, 19; cf. 89, 10).

ABDE: 11 17.

ABEC: 10. ABECp: 19.

ACBE: 1 99.

ADCE: 60 66. ADCpE: 8 44 65.

3) *Three items.*

ABC: 61.

ABE: 7 18 24 32 47 53 64 72 75 80 82 (two contracts on one tablet) 84 95.

ACE: 97. ACdE: 2 35 42.

4) *Two items.*

AE: 6 14 39 69 79 90.

Tehiptilla, the son of Puhishenni, appears as the purchaser in nearly all these tablets; aside from 59 (where Hanadu adopts Hutiya), the following other persons are named as purchasers: Ennamati, the son of Tehiptilla (68 98); Gil-Teshub, the son of Hutiya (29 83 85); Haish-Teshub, the son of Puhishenni (66); Hutarraphi (78); Kurpazah (87); Musheya, the son of Hashiya (39 88); Nuisheri (60); Tarmitilla, the son of Shurkitilla (9 61); Udhapu, the son of Hashiya (47(?) 89); Winnirgi (a woman) (82). The seller is usually a man; but there are also instances of two men (25 29 38 52 73 80 83), two brothers (15 19 39 70 77), two relatives (46 66), a woman (18), a man and a woman (31 68), three brothers (94 97); two brothers and another man (67), and three brothers and another man (71).

This cursory examination cannot convey an adequate impression of the philological and historical importance of these documents.² It is to be hoped that the other volumes of autographed texts and of interpretation, promised in this series, will be issued in a not too distant future. The author and the publisher deserve high commendation for this undertaking.

ROBERT H. PFEIFFER.

Harvard University.

² G. Conteneau (*Les Tablettes de Kerkouk et les Origines de la Civilisation Assyrienne. Extrait de Babyloniaca ix.* Paris, Geuthner, 1926) has studied the seal impressions, the writing, and the proper names of the tablets found in the same region, similar to those published by Chiera, that were known in 1926, for the purpose of determining the relations of the Hurri with the Assyrians and with the Hittites.

A Study of Races in the Ancient Near East. By WILLIAM H. WORRELL. New York: D. APPLETON AND COMPANY, 1927. xiv + 139 pp., with 19 illustrations.

Professor Worrell has produced a very comprehensive little book. In a little over a hundred pages the reader is introduced to the main facts of Near Eastern geography and ethnology; to the interrelationship of the Mediterraneans, Alpines, Nordics, and Finno-Ugrians, the Hamites and Semites; and lastly, to the principal linguistic and racial characteristics of the Hamites, the Semites, and the Aryans.

The book addresses itself primarily to the general reader. This may account for the many excellencies and the few shortcomings of the work. In the first place, the study is written in a style that is at once brisk and lucid. Dr. Worrell discusses the numerous problems involved with the sure touch of one who has done much original work in the field. The reader is bound to appreciate an exposition that is authoritative and simple at the same time.

On the other hand, the distinction between hypothesis and fact is not sufficiently sharp. That Welsh syntax may have been affected by the non-Indo-European Pictish substratum (pp. 50 ff.) is quite possible; but we scarcely have sufficient grounds to consider Pictish a Hamitic language on the basis of alleged syntactic similarities with Hamitic dialects. The specialist may find such a statement suggestive, the general reader is likely to be misled into accepting it as an established fact. Nor is the discussion of Hamito-Semitic affinities uniformly convincing. What can be unqualifiedly accepted, however, is the author's conclusion that "Hamitic and Semitic are fundamentally related, and that Hamitic represents the survival of conditions more primitive than those to be found in Semitic" (p. 78).

The author seems also to lean too heavily on his favorite theory of polarity. It must not be forgotten that, while polarity is very helpful as an illustration, the psychological principles behind polarity are themselves in need of a satisfactory explanation.

With these few reservations the book can be heartily recommended. It more than accomplishes the purpose, modestly set forth in the preface, of being "agreeable to general readers, and not offensive to the learned."

Die Adoption im altbabylonischen Recht. (*Leipziger rechtswissenschaftliche Studien*, Heft 23). By Dr. iur. MARTIN DAVID. Leipzig: THEODOR WEICHER, 1927. v + 121 pp. M. 8.

The legal and social aspects of adoption as reflected in Sumerian and Akkadian sources are admirably surveyed in this exhaustive monograph. From early Sumerian times, through the series *ana ittišu* and the somewhat involved clauses of the Code of Hammurabi, Dr. David follows the institution of adoption to the Middle Assyrian period. The work is thorough and careful. The widely scattered material has been judiciously sifted. Scholars will welcome this monograph as a convenient introduction to a subject to which abundant new material has recently been added in the first volume of the Nuzi series.¹

E. A. SPEISER.

University of Pennsylvania.

Archaeology and the Bible. By GEORGE A. BARTON, Philadelphia, AMERICAN SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION, 1925. xv + 561 pp., 122 plates.

This is the fourth edition of a work which has become indispensable to all real students of the Bible. There is in this edition much more material than in the third. Nothing of real importance has been omitted. Some of the new features are an appendix on the place of the Amorites in the Civilization of Western Asia, where the Amurru theory is disproved. Among the additions to the New Testament material we find the Chalice of Antioch which Mr. Barton dates 120-140 A. D. The author has also included an excellent translation of the Hittite Code of Laws.

J. A. MAYNARD.

Forest Hills, N. Y.

Rossel Island: An Ethnological Study. By W. E. ARMSTRONG, M. A. CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS. 1928. 8vo.; pp. xxviii + 274.

In this book Mr. Armstrong provides a survey of certain important aspects of the culture of the most eastwardly island in the

¹ *Inheritance Texts.* By E. Chiera. Paris: Geuthner, 1927.

Louisiade Archipelago, off the southeastern coast of New Guinea. Discovered by Bougainville during his Pacific voyage of 1766-1769, the island was named about thirty years later after the master of D'Entrecasteaux' ship. It has had few voluntary visitors since its discovery, and none, before Mr. Armstrong, who made more than a few casual observations on its inhabitants. Seventy years ago three hundred Chinese passengers of the ship *Saint Paul* on their way to the Australian gold fields went, with two or three exceptions, to swell the islanders' food supply. The history of this episode, together with that of Rossel's less intimate contacts with alien life, is contained in an Appendix where the original sources are cited. The question of cannibalism in the island and the relation of the Chinese victims to the normal functioning of this custom are discussed in Chapter IX.

A valuable Introduction is contributed by Dr. A. C. Haddon, who sums up the contributions of Mr. Armstrong and others to the physical anthropology of Rossel Island and the rest of the Massim area of southeastern New Guinea, and finds that Professor Seligman's views as to the racial composition of the Massim are broadly confirmed by the data from Rossel. It appears that the Rossel Islanders, "while agreeing in many respects with Seligman's southern group of the Massim, have also a strong infusion of the northern group." The latter, taller element is similar in appearance to the Polynesians, and Dr. Haddon considers that probably "the bearers of the higher culture to the Massim area are mainly of this type." The evidence from language (non-Melanesian in Rossel), from the material culture, from the mythology, and from the totemic and other features of the social organization tends to confirm that from physical anthropology, viz., that an aboriginal culture, perhaps Papuan, has been overlaid by several waves of migration, and that this has produced a type similar to that of the Massim area in general, but that Rossel, as might be expected from its isolated situation, has retained more primitive features.

In Appendix III, Mr. Armstrong has an acutely reasoned discussion of the *General Theory of the Classificatory System of Relationship*, in which he maintains that the views of the late Dr. W. H. R. Rivers concerning the classificatory system, usually so called, are "in certain respects untenable." This discussion, with Chapter IV, on the *Relationship System* of Rossel Island, and

Chapter III, *Tribe, Clan, and Family*—on which last the theoretical discussion of the Appendix and Chapter III has also a bearing—forms the chief contribution of the book to sociological theory.

The author holds that Rivers's definition of "classificatory" involves two other types of relationship, which he names "open class" and "closed class" systems. The two kinds of "classes" refer respectively to the distinction and to the partial grouping together of generations for the purpose of intermarriage; the Rossel system, like others which are "'classificatory' in the usual sense of the term," represents a third stage of development in which the distinction by generations disappears.

The "intermarrying exogamous groups" of Rossel are characterized by matrilineal descent and the possession of linked totems similar to those of the southern Massim, but with the important distinction that one of the totems, a snake, in Rossel is ranked as a god. Among the southern Massim there is no rigid avoidance of the snake totem, while in Rossel Island snakes that function as totems are avoided and feared by all clans.

The author also takes issue with Rivers for regarding, as he says, the family and other relationship groups as being of the same "logical type" as, e. g., occupational groups and the village. The tribal relation he would bring under the former type and describes it "as the relation of solidarity, so that the tribal grouping of a persons is the sequence of persons"—on the analogy of the definition of family grouping and, indeed, actually to a great degree as the outcome of family relationships—"towards whom he experiences solidarity: the remoter the member of his tribe, the slighter the solidarity with that person." The notion of spatial relations is brought in to supplement this.

The monetary system involves usury and an elaborate estimation of values, and has a close relation to a great part of the ceremonial usages. Arbitrary values have been assigned to "coins"—of shell of two different kinds—values which are not based entirely on the rarity of those of higher denominations but also on custom. The resulting difficulty of "making change" has given rise to a class of brokers who make a profit by transferring possession of coins. Some of these men acquire wealth and attain to such importance in the community as to become chiefs.

Mr. Armstrong's book is a valuable contribution to our knowledge of Melanesian peoples, and it is greatly to be hoped that he will be able to complete his investigations especially of the two subjects his introductory examination of which has already had such fruitful results.

H. U. HALL.

University Museum,
Philadelphia.

MĪR 'ALĪ SHĪR. *The volume in commemoration of the 500th anniversary of his birth.* Published by the Academy of Sciences of the U. S. S. R. Leningrad: 1928. 2 + ii + 174 pp.

The great Chaghatay-Turkish poet, philosopher, and statesman Mīr 'Alī Shīr Navāyī was born in Herat in 844 A. H. Thus in 1926 A. D. (= 1344 A. H.) were completed five centuries (of the Mohammedan era) from the date of his birth. Therefore the Russian Academy of Sciences, through its Perpetual Secretary, promised the First Turcological Congress at Baku, in March, 1926, that it would publish a volume dedicated to his memory. Just two years later this appeared under the editorship of W. Barthold. The contents of it are a brief preface by the editor; four articles, two of which are devoted especially to Navāyī; and five reviews.

The article of A. Samoilovitch gives us a sketch of the history and development of the literary Central-Asiatic Turkish language. Historically this language has passed three periods, not clearly separated: the first, in which the cultural centre was at Kashgar, begins with the Qarakhanids' kingdom (10th century); the second, in Khwarezm, from about the 12th century; and the third, in the country of the Timurids, from the 15th to the beginning of the 20th c. Several examples of the lexicographical material of these periods are given.

E. Berthels in his comparison between Navāyī and 'Aṭṭār discusses the question of the influence of 'Aṭṭār's poem *Manṭiq at-Ṭair* on the *Lisān at-Ṭair* of Navāyī. This is, perhaps, the most valuable article in the volume. The principal idea of the author is that when we have two works with an identical theme, the latter one may also be important, if the borrowed theme is treated in another way. He compared the two poems carefully, almost verse by verse,

and his conclusion is very favorable to Navāyī: of 63 stories introduced by Navāyī in his poem only 12 are borrowed from the poem of 'Aṭṭār and 51 are independent. Moreover we must highly appreciate the pages of Berthels' work dealing with the Sufism of the Turkish poet.

The next article, of A. Romaskevitch, describes a manuscript belonging to the Library of Petersburg University. It is the Chaghatay-Persian dictionary of Fath 'Alī Khān, another copy of which was described by the Hungarian Turcologist József Thúry.

The deeply scientific and brilliant work of the editor is devoted to the study of the political and social life in Herat at the time of Mīr 'Alī Shīr. The principal aim of W. Barthold was to give a picture of the real life and to correct the panegyrical and fantastic ideas which have been formed by Oriental and European authors. Of course, the learned author has succeeded in this. Especially this article is directed against the work of Belin on Mīr 'Alī Shīr.

Four of the five critical notes, written by A. Samoilovitch, deal with books published on Navāyī in Azarbaijan and Turkestan by native writers. And generally the opinion of the critic is favorable to the oriental authors.

N. MARTINOVITCH.

Columbia University.

Indian Serpent Lore, or the Nāgas in Hindu Legend and Art.

By J. PH. VOGEL. London: PROBSTHAIN, 1926 (actually 1927). Pp. 318, with 30 plates.

Professor Vogel (pp. 4-6) is inclined to doubt the non-Aryan character of the serpent cults. It is quite true that the Rig Veda Saṁhitā does not give us a complete picture of old Indian civilization, but it is precisely the non-Aryan elements that are lacking, and in my view both Macdonell (*Vedic Mythology*, p. 153) and Oldenberg are right in deducing, from their absence in the hymns, the non-Aryan character of the Nāgas. In this connection the occurrence of a faïence tablet with a representation of a Nāga, recently found at Mohenjo Daro (see *Illustrated London News*, March 26, 1926), and certainly pre-Aryan, is of interest. The pre- and non-Aryan population of India worshipped, not the gods of the Brah-

mans, but Yakṣas, Nāgas, and goddesses—about whom the Vedas, naturally, tell us very little.¹

It is in the Epics, and Pali and Prakrit literature that we first hear much about the Nāgas. Now nothing is commoner than for a conquering race to adopt the literary and mythological traditions of the conquered; the heroes of the Arthurian cycle are not the less Celtic because we know them largely from French versions. The Epics belong to a period when Aryan and native culture had been almost completely fused; that the Nāgas, like the Yakṣas and goddesses, here bear Sanskrit names proves little, and we certainly cannot argue from this that hymns to Yakṣas, Nāgas, and goddesses of fertility and increase were accidentally omitted from the Vedic collections.

Professor Vogel remarks that trees haunted by Nāgas are of rare occurrence; but the following may be added to the examples cited: Fergusson, *Tree and Serpent Worship*, pl. LXXII (Nāginis under trees); the Pāṭaliputra railing (Waddell, *Excavation at Pataliputra*, 1903, pl. I); *Mahābhārata*, southern recension 12.69.41 ff., where Nāgas are mentioned amongst the beings dwelling in sacred trees.

Nāga Kals² are mentioned and illustrated, but more complicated forms (*nāga dangaya* etc.) are found in Ceylon (my *Mediaeval Sinhalese Art*, index, s. v. Nāga, and Pls. VII, 6 and LII, 3). *Nāgabandhu* is stated to be the *aśvattha* tree; but a *nāgabandha* in Ceylon and southern India is the stop of a chamfer, in form like a cobra hood, and found at the passage from the four to the eight-sided part of a pillar; and also a type of perforated window, with interlacing cobras.^{2a}

In connection with Śeṣa, reference might have been made to the Nāga brackets which occur as pedestal supports (*e.g.* at Caṇḍi Loro Jongrang) in Java; these have been discussed by Bosch ("Linga-Heiligdom van Dinaja," *Tijdschr. k. Bat. Genootschap*, LXIV, 1924, p. 263). Incidentally it may be remarked that Bosch's

¹ Vedic references to serpents are fully discussed by Keith, *Religion and philosophy of the Veda* (1925).

² In this connection *Taittirīya Saṃhitā* VI, 1, 10 is of interest: "Thus do I entwine the necks of the biting serpents . . . the serpents do not bite that year."

^{2a} See *J. A. O. S.*, Vol. 48, p. 265, *nāga-vandha*.

view that the yoni element of the lingam-yoni represents the Earth is confirmed by such early (Gupta) representations as that of the sealing from Basārḥ, Bloch, "*Excavations at Basārḥ*," *A. S. I., A. R.*, 1903-04, Pl. XL, 2.

Reference might well have been made to the story of Rāja Adi who was found sleeping by Droṇa under the guardianship of a serpent, whence the place name Ahikṣetra or Ahicchatra (Beal, *Buddhist Records*, p. 200, and Cunningham, *Reports*, I, pp. 255, 256).

The mode of attachment of the Nāga hoods to a human body, discussed on p. 40, is first clearly shown in the Rāmagrāma composition (here fig. 4) of Sāñcī, south gate, middle architrave, outer face, where a Nāga and Nāgī, bowing, are shown in side and nearly back view, the body of the snake extending downwards along the spine.

In connection with Zaḥḥak (p. 40) it might have been remarked that a similar type occurs early, in the figure of Ningishuīda, with serpents rising from his shoulders, worshipped by Gudea (Ward, *Seal Cylinders*, p. 376); also that characteristic "nāgas", with human bust and serpent body appear regularly in early Babylonian (Sumerian) art (Ward, *ib.*, Ch. XVIII, and figs. 362-365 and 1247, 1249).

As regards the Nāgarāja Elāpattra (pp. 39, 213, and Pl. III), I have shown that Elāpattra is not an equivalent of Airāvata, and have explained the relief in detail, in *J. R. A. S.*, 1928.

In connection with the keeping of cobras as household animals (pp. 20, 274), I may mention that the late Thakur J. Seesodia informed me that such a cobra was kept as a sacred pet in his family, that his grandmother would sleep with it coiled round her waist, and that it was necessary that every bride entering the house should be properly introduced to the cobra.

Now with reference to the old Nāga images of Mathurā. Professor Vogel says: "Modern images of Baladeva . . . are nothing but imitations of the ancient Nāga figures. How the images of the Nāgas came to be confounded by the villagers with effigies of Baladeva (or Balarāma), the elder brother of Kṛishṇa, it is not difficult to explain. Baladeva is believed to be an incarnation of Śeṣha . . ." But in view of the fact that already in the Mahābhārata (see Hopkins, *Epic Mythology*, p. 212) Baladeva is described



FIG. 1. Śeṣa nāga, Śrīśailam, ca. 16th century



FIG. 2. *Ahigundika Jātaka* (?),
Amarāvati.



FIG. 3. A nāga Jātaka, Amarāvati.

as having his head wreathed with snakes, it seems quite possible that some of the ancient images which we call Nāgas were originally effigies of Balarāma. Certainly the four-headed deity at Osiā, ca. ninth century (Bhandarkar, in *A. S. I., A. R.*, 1908-09, p. 106) who holds a ploughshare and mace, rides on Garuda, and has the five hoods of a serpent about his head is Baladeva. Cunningham, *A. S. Reports*, VI, 21, mentions a serpent-hooded "Baldeo" image at Rūp Bās, over 27 feet in height. Professor Vogel does not refer to the related subject of Bacchanalian Nāgas, and Maitreya-like Nāgas holding an *amṛta* flask. Here too there may be some connection with Baladeva, who is described in the *Mahābhārata* as a heavy drinker.

No reference seems to be made to the traditional association of snakes with sandal trees, a subject frequently illustrated in representations of Āsāvārī and Rāmakalī Rāginīs in Rajput paintings (see *Catalogue of the Indian Collections*, Boston, Vol. V, No. LVIII, LXX).³ With reference to the keeping of snakes in earthen vessels, as in the story of Bāsu Nāg (pp. 256, 257), other Rāginī paintings are of interest (Boston Catalogue, *ibid.* No. LXXVI), while earthen pots with twining snakes are to be found in Ceylon (my *Mediaeval Sinhalese Art*, Pl. XXVI, 6).

The book is admirably illustrated. Amongst the few important representations of Nāgas that might well have been added may be mentioned the very fine relief of a five-headed Nāga which is cut in the living rock and guards the pool at Mihintale in Ceylon, and the relief of Ādi Śeṣa in the Śiva temple at Śrīsāilam (Fig. 1).

Probably the oldest Nāga image for which extant evidence is available is represented by the stone hoods of Maurya date from Rajgir, now NS. 3 in the Calcutta Museum (*Mem. A. S. I.*, 30, p. 44).

Professor Vogel makes a brilliant identification of the Amarāvati scenes reproduced on Plate VII. The relief of the Kālīka story is one of the loveliest of Amarāvati sculptures, and has not, I think, been published before. It is in the British Museum. Here (Fig. 2) I illustrate another Amarāvati relief now in Madras, which might belong either to the Champeyya or the Bhūridatta Jātaka; but the

³ Reference to the caste of the great Nāga kings will be found in the *Chinnamastā Dhyānam*, *ibid.*, p. 137.

presence of a monkey points more definitely to the Ahigunḍika Jātaka. Another Amarāvati group I am unable to identify (Fig. 3); it is, I believe, in the Madras Museum, and represents a princely personage stepping across or upon two Nāgas; the scene is apparently at a *ghāt*, suggested by the presence of several fishermen; similar to this is another Madras fragment, Golonbew photo No. 62642. The principal figure is followed by one in monastic robes, and between his legs there appears another figure, half seen, with hands respectfully folded, which may be the Nāga in human form. The scene is published here in the hope that Professor Vogel or some other student may be able to identify it.⁴

Professor Vogel's book is an admirably prepared and almost exhaustive account of its subject, and it is not by way of criticism, but as a contribution to the subject, that the above suggestions are made. It is also very well produced, and remarkably free of misprints; I have noticed only *Śeshon a* for *on Śesha*, in the list of illustrations and p. 35, line 22, *tutelaty* for *tutelary*. The value of the work is greatly enhanced by the excellent index.

India: the landscape, the monuments, and the people. By MARTIN HÜRLIMAN. Berlin: "Orbis Terrarum" Series, 1928. xxxiv pp., 1 map, 304 plates.

This is an Indian picture book, with an introduction. The author's admirable and well-chosen photographs present an adequate picture of a living culture in vital relation to its actual environment. The author's point of view is scholarly; but his purpose is to "let the beauty of the country and its monuments speak for itself." It is quite incorrect to say that "Buddha dissipated the castes"; he did not concern himself in any way with the social order, except to recommend to the Vajjians the continuance of existing institutions, nor was the caste system even fully developed in

⁴ Still another relief from Amarāvati, in the Madras Museum (A. S. I. photo B. 165, India Office Serial No. 770, Golonbew No. 62716) shows a coiled serpent seated, so to speak, in a cane chair, and curiously regarded by a man and woman who stand beside the chair, looking down upon it. Cf. Ferguson, *Tree and Serpent Worship*, Pl. LXIII, 1, same subject.


the Buddha's time. It is however just to say (and few general writers on India have realised this) in connection with the decline of Buddhism in India that "the incomparable affective values which were the issue have, perhaps, a social foundation." The "white Brahmin cord" is not worn only by Brahmans, but also by Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, and "good Śūdras" such as the southern Vellālas. "Adventures with women" is a poor and undiscerning term to use in connection with the Kṛṣṇa Līlā. "Zoological garden" is a curious version of the "deer park" at Benares. Some now discarded identifications are retained, e. g. the Maheśa at Elephanta is still called a Trimūrti, and the Gaṅgāvatarāṇa at Māmallapuram Arjuna's Penance. For some unknown reason the terms Pallava and Chola are preceded by the qualification "so-called." Misprints are comparatively few: one notes Jamapuri for Yamapuri (p. xxiii), Ghau for Ghaus (p. xxvii), and Jahai for Jahan (p. xxix). Volumes on Indo-China and Ceylon, and on Nepal and Tibet are to follow, and will be welcomed.

Basreliefs of Bādāmī. By R. D. BANERJĪ. Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India, No. 25. Calcutta, 1928. 62 pp; 27 plates.

This is an admirable and adequately illustrated account of all the sculptures in caves I to IV at Bādāmī. One of these caves is dated 578, and all belong to the latter part of the 6th century. The reliefs are equally important as examples of Indian Art and as illustrations of the mythology. Those illustrating the rape of the Soma by Garuḍa seem to be unique. The representation of Brahmā as *nābhīja* seems to be the earliest known, for the Deogarh Brahmā is indeed *abaja* but the stem of the lotus is not connected with Viṣṇu's navel; and Bhandarkar (*Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism*, etc., p. 45) is able to cite only eighth century examples from Elūrā and Sirpur. It is remarkable that in the Trivikrama compositions of caves II and IV, the figure of Śukra¹ holding the *dakṣiṇoda* is represented like a Buddha, with *ūrṇā*, *uṣṇīṣa*, and *saṃghāṭī*.

¹ See *J. R. A. S.*, 1929, p. 153, correcting *ib.*, 1928, p. 835, note 2.


The bull and elephant design (fig. 3) under the *dvārapāla* of cave I (p. 3) is called simply "an elephant fighting with a bull;"




1. From one of the Virūpākṣa pillars, Paṭṭadakal, ca. 740.



2. Hampi, Achyuta Raja's temple, Longhurst, *Hampi Ruins*, fig. 51.



3. Bādāmī, cave I, veranda.



From Ceylon.

but this design, which occurs elsewhere, really represents a bull and elephant facing, with heads so ingeniously combined that a single form fits both animals. It is an interesting example of the "animal style" and is to be correlated with other designs of like ancestry, e. g. the widely distributed forms representing two or more animals of one species so arranged that a single head serves equally well for each. A small sculpture combining a bull, elephant, and ram has been found at Mohenjodaro, and is reproduced in the *Illustrated London News*, January 14, 1928, p. 44, fig. 4. The bull-elephant combination is known in Ceylon as *usaṃba-kuñjara*, and in southern India as *viṛaṣuba-kunṣara* corresponding to Sanskrit *vṛṣabha-kuñjara*. Various occurrences of this form are shown in the accompanying illustrations: Fig. 1, on a pillar of the Virūpākṣa temple at Paṭṭadakal, Cousens, *loc. cit. supra*, pl. XLIV; Fig. 2, Hampi, Longhurst, A. H., *Hampi ruins*, fig. 51; Fig. 3, Bādāmī, Cave I, *ut supra*; Fig. 4, Ceylon, my *Mediaeval Sinhalese art*, fig. 27. Another example appears on a late south Indian ivory illustrated by Goetz, "Geschnitzte Elfenbeinbüchsen aus Südindien," *Jahrb. as. Kunst*, II, 1925.

The designation Cave IV is now given to what used to be called Cave III or the "Great Vaiṣṇava Cave," but the Plates (15-27) from this Cave are erroneously numbered as coming from Cave III, which in the new numbering of the text refers only to a small Cave without reliefs except a doubtful Bodhisattva. Further, to accord with the text, Plate 14 should be described as from Caves III and IV, not from Cave III alone.

ANANDA K. COOMARASWAMY.

Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.

NOTES OF THE SOCIETY

The family of the late Professor MAURICE BLOOMFIELD has presented to the Library of our Society a large collection of letters received by him, over a period of nearly fifty years, from many distinguished orientalists and philologists. The letters number about two hundred; many are long and of great scholarly interest. All members of the Society will surely wish to associate themselves with the expression of gratitude to the donors which was tendered by a resolution adopted at the Society's last meeting. It is hoped, further, that this example will be followed in the future by other distinguished members of the Society or their heirs. Such collections will constitute a permanent and very valuable enrichment of our records.

Professor A. V. Williams Jackson, as an appointed representative of the American Oriental Society, attended the twenty-fifth anniversary meeting of the American Academy of Arts and Letters held in New York, April 23-24.

THE ORIGIN AND ANTIQUITY OF THE MANDEANS

C. H. KRAELING

The old saw from Shakespeare's Twelfth Night about those who have greatness thrust upon them applies quite happily, it would seem, to the Mandaeans, for in all probability no one would be more surprised at the widespread discussion which they have latterly occasioned than the Mandaic artisans of modern Bagdad and the Mandaic farmers, if such there still be, in the lower Euphrates valley.

The Mandaeans may go on with their normal mode of life and disregard the discussions of their own significance. We, fortunately or unfortunately, can avoid neither the issue they have raised in the minds of scholars, nor the increasing flow of literature produced by the issue, particularly in Germany. The literature so far as it is not already listed in my *Mandaic Bibliography*¹ will be referred to below. The issue might be formulated in the words: Have we in the religious tradition and thought of the Mandaic sect the key to the origin and development of the conception of redemption as it found expression in nascent Christianity and in Hellenistic syncretism?

Now it is indeed a far cry from modern Iraq to the hellenistic Orient. The first task which anyone dealing with the theories of the "religionsgeschichtliche Schule" on the subject of the Mandaeans should therefore set himself is the study of the history of the sect. Only after we have to the best of our ability fixed a place for them in the history of the religious development of the Orient can we discuss the nature and the value of their contribution to the study of Christian antiquity.

1. The Mandaeans of modern Iraq first came to the attention of the western world in the late sixteenth century. It was a Jesuit mission, working under cover of the Portuguese domination of the Indian Ocean, that discovered them living in extensive communities in and about Baṣra of the Iraq-al-Arabi, where they are said to have numbered approximately fifteen thousand souls, as well as in the neighboring Persian province of Khuzistan. Because they called themselves *Naṣoraiē d'Yahya* (Naṣoreans of John) and

¹ *JAOS.*, vol. 46, pp. 49-55.

because in Arabic *an-Nasara* is the normal designation of the Christians, the Mandeans became known to the West as "the Christians of St. John (the Baptist)," a name that clung to them in the textbooks for some time.

Neither the contact with the Jesuits nor that with the discaled Carmelites which followed when the British gained control of the East, redounded to the happiness of the Mandaic sect. Enforced privations, military conscription and deportation, all imposed by a horribly misguided religious zeal, ushered in a period of suffering which decimated its numbers to such an extent that to-day the sect is in the last stages of the process of disintegration. One might fancy that the Mandaic bogey haunting the Christian scholars of modern Europe were but the ghost of the maltreated Mandaic sect refusing to be laid and revenging itself upon its persecutors.

Once the curiosity aroused by the initial discovery of the Mandeans had been satisfied they ceased to be a subject of discussion, remaining in this condition of disregard some two centuries. Travellers in the Orient occasionally reported that they continued to exist, compends continued to mention them among the *curiosa* which compends will mention, but that was about all. Only the new impetus given to Oriental studies in the nineteenth century brought the Mandeans to the fore. Manuscripts of Mandaic Holy Writ, such as had reached the famous Maronite Orientalist Abraham Ekmellensis in the early seventeenth century were now studied with care. Orientalists and scholarly minded officials from France, England and Germany visited the surviving Mandaic groups, studying their language, their living tradition and their customs, and brought with them more and more of the codices in which was embodied the Mandaic theology.

Virtually all the texts represented by these codices have now been published by Lidzbarski.² They represent a body of tradition that compares favorably in size at least with the Koran and the Old Testament. To the evidence thus placed at our disposal for the study of the sect must be added that produced as incidental to archæological excavations into the more ancient strata of Oriental civilization, namely, the Mandaic bowls from Khuwabir, published by Pognon, those from Nippur published by Professor Montgom-

² The three important publications are, *Das Johannesbuch der Mandäer*, 2 vols., 1905-1915; *Mandäische Liturgien*, 1920; and *Ginza*, 1925.

ery and the lead amulets of which one has been published by Lidzbarski.³

The study of these Mandaic texts at once showed that it was incorrect to think of the Mandeans as a Christian sect, or to speak of them as "Christians of St. John". For, though in their mythological outlook they differed but slightly from such as Mani, who none the less styled himself "an apostle of Jesus Christ", there existed a fundamental difference between the Mandeans and all those groups properly or improperly designated in the past as Christian sects, namely this, that they definitely rejected Jesus, considering him to be the very impersonation of all that is evil and deceitful. To the Mandeans Jesus is the Meshiha daggala, the false or lying Messiah, the Antichrist, the offspring of the Evil Spirit herself and the manifestation of the malignant planetary deity Nbu, the Assyrian Nabu or Mercury. A hymn in the Oxford collection warns the faithful against him as follows:

Beware my brethren,
Beware my beloved,
Beware my brethren
Of the worthless Jesus Christ,
Of him who makes false representations
And who distorts my words.⁴

The first part of the ninth book of the "right Ginza" in listing the false religions or "gates"⁵ that exist in the world, presents evidence of calumniations of the Christians no less horrible than those current in the western world according to the testimony of the early Christian apologists.

The nearest approach to the intensity of their hatred of the Christians is found in the vituperations which they utter against the Jews. Of this people, the chosen folk of the evil planetary deity Shamesh, they say:

³ Pognon, H., *Inscriptions mandaites des coupes de Khouabir*, Paris, 1898; Montgomery, J. A., *Aramaic Incantation Texts from Nippur*, Philadelphia, 1913; Lidzbarski, M., "Ein mandäisches Amulett," *Florilegium Melchior de Voguë*, Paris, 1910, pp. 249-375.

⁴ *Mand. Lit.*, p. 192.

⁵ *Ginza*, pp. 223-234. The use of "gate" for religion clarifies the meaning of the question "What is the gate of Jesus" which was put to James according to Hegesippus (Eusebius, *H. E.*, ii, 23).

He, Adonai, chose for himself a people and founded a synagogue. Jerusalem is built, the city of the Jews, who circumcise themselves with the sword, sprinkle their faces with their blood and thus adore Adonai. The men leave their wives and cohabit with one another. In their monthly period the women have intercourse with their men. They desert the true doctrine of the first days and compose a book for themselves.

To you I say, my elect, have nothing to do with these slaves, who have whored away from their Lord.⁶

This enmity toward Jew and Christian alike presents a peculiar problem to the student of Mandaic lore, for nothing is more certain than that the Mandaic scriptures are replete with echoes of Old Testament tradition and no small amount of evidence can be adduced to show that Christian thought and practice helped to mould Mandaic belief. Burkitt has made something of a case for the use of the Peshitta of Ps. 29, 5-9, in the Ginza,⁷ and much more might be said for the Mandaic observance of the *האכשאה*, the *הַרְבִּישׁוּבָא*, or Sunday, as a practice taken over from the Christians.

The difficulty which the twofold attitude to both Christians and Jews presents is that of determining the time and the sequence of the proximity and revulsion therein presupposed. To this question we shall return later. Suffice it to say at this point that the cause for the antipathy against the Christians must lie in the period antedating the arrival of the Jesuit mission in Mesopotamia because the hatred is directed against an organized Church, and is recorded in documents antedating the last years of the sixteenth century.⁸

2. Once the idea that the Mandeans were a Christian sect was dropped by western scholars, it became necessary to find a new place for them in the history of the religious development of the Orient.

When discovered by the Jesuits, the Mandeans dwelt among the Mohammedans in a relatively undisturbed state. As far as the

⁶ *Ginza*, p. 25, sect. 166-167.

⁷ "Note on *Ginza Rabba* 174," *Jour. Theol. Stud.*, XXIX, 1928, pp. 235-237.

⁸ The hatred against Jews and Christians seems to rise out of a period of persecution. It is interesting to note that in their dealings with persecutors the Mandeans were allowed to follow the course of action also permitted to Jews, under certain conditions, namely, that of giving way to their persecutors. Cf. *Ginza*, p. 29, and G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, vol. II, 1927, pp. 106-107.

Mandeans are concerned, this peaceful co-residence has little significance, for in Mesopotamia they represented a religious minority, they loved the Mohammedans not at all and spoke of the prophet as the son of a magician Bizbat.⁹ As far as the Mohammedans are concerned, who were of course in the majority, and who were as intolerant as the Mandeans, though for a different reason, the peaceful co-residence would seem to be significant. It would appear to indicate that the Moslem rulers classed the Mandeans with those called "dhimmi", i. e. the ones with whom a compact for religious toleration had been made.

The Mohammedans granted religious toleration to such as worshipped the one God and were in possession of some form of the revelation of that one God. Now the Koran mentions three groups of *dhimmi*, the Jews, the Christians and the Sabiun or Sabians, not to be confused with the Sabeian family of Semitic peoples. If the Mandeans were tolerated by the Mohammedans, and if by reason of their animosity against Christians and Jews they could hardly be connected with either of these religious groups, it would seem to follow that they represent the Sabians of the Koran.

This conclusion was actually drawn by the Orientalists of the nineteenth century in their endeavor to give the Mandeans a place in the religious development of the Orient, and a number of arguments were advanced to uphold the identification. The first was that their Mohammedan neighbors in modern times called the Mandeans *Ṣubba*, a broken plural of *Ṣabi*, formed after the analogy of the transition from *fa'ilun* to *fu'alun*. The second was an etymology of the word *Ṣabi* in which, by the use of the root *צבע*, the name was rendered "baptists" and thus made applicable to the Mandeans with their well-known stress upon baptismal lustrations. The third was the support given to this etymological identification by reference to a passage in the *Fihrist* of An-Nadim where the Sabians are said to embrace the *Mughtasila*, a sect whose name signifies "those who wash themselves".¹⁰ The last was the similarity between Mandaic and Sabeian practice, such as the northward orientation in prayer and the use of the girdle.

The identification of the Mandeans and the Sabians which was supported by these arguments and which would automatically date the Mandaic sect back to the days of the tradition embodied in the

⁹ *Ginza*, p. 30, sect. 203.

¹⁰ Flügel, *Mani*, 1862, pp. 133-134.

Koran was not without its difficulties. These difficulties lay in the references made to the Šabeans by late Arabic writers like Moses Maimonides, Shahrastani and Masudi. They tell us, for instance, that the Chalif al-Qahir (932-934) consulted the eminent jurist Abu Saïd al Ishtakhri as to whether the Šabeans should continue to be tolerated and that he was told that they should be exterminated, since they worshipped the planets.¹¹ The charge is corroborated by an-Nadim (987 A. D.), who adds the information that the Šabeans are dualists.¹² The Šabeans of whom these writers speak are, moreover, said to live in the district of Harran.

None of these facts, if facts they be, really fit our Mandeans. They dwell in Mohammedan times in Mesene, in the lower Euphrates valley, there are dualistic elements in their teaching, but fundamentally they are monotheists, and certainly they never worshipped the evil planets. How then can they be the Šabeans of late Mohammedan times?

Chwolson in his famous work on the Šabeans pointed a way out of this difficulty. He showed that Abu Bekr ibn Wa'hshijah in 903 A. D. distinguished between Harranian and Babylonian Šabeans¹³ and that according to a Christian writer, Abu Yusuf (late ninth century, quoted by An-Nadim), the Harranian Šabeans are really no Šabeans at all but rather a group of pagan dualists who had adopted the name in 833 A. D. in the effort to gain the protection it afforded.¹⁴ The assumption then is that the later Arabic writers have failed to observe the distinction between Harranian and Babylonian Šabeans, and that the latter are not dualists.

It seems natural to suppose that the Mandeans are actually these tenth century Babylonian Šabeans, and that these in turn are the Šabeans of the Koran, but even here there are difficulties. In the first place the etymological argument in support of the identification is weak, the root סבא being the one that actually gives us the form Sabiun. In the second place the Mandeans never speak of themselves as Šabeans, and in the third place we have no way of telling anything about the Šabeans of the Koran.

The uncertainty which exists on these points might at first glance seem to create the impression that it is hopeless to try to trace

¹¹ Chwolson, *Die Ssabier*, St. Petersburg, 1856, vol. II, pp. 543-544.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 541.

¹³ *Ibid.*, vol. I, p. 135.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, vol. II, pp. 14-17.

the Mandeans back of the late Mohammedan milieu, and at least one German scholar, Peterson, has latterly swung to this extreme in his treatment of the sect.¹⁵ He might argue not alone from the uncertainty regarding the identity of the Šabeans, but also from two other premises. The first is that the earliest Mandaic MS. is dated 1590 A. D., the second is that Mohammed is explicitly mentioned in a number of the religious texts.

Peterson's conclusions are as unwarranted as those of some who go to the opposite extreme. A number of facts require consideration in this connection. First, the Mohammedan era, while it was certainly productive of sectarian divisions among the followers of the prophet himself, and while it possibly permitted the survival of syncretistic religious beliefs (viz., the Harranian), was entirely unsuited to the creation of new syncretistic faiths like that of the Mandeans. Second, the Mohammedan era is not the time for the engenderment of that intense hatred of Christians and Jews to which the texts give expression. Third, while the MS. evidence for the Mandaic religion may not antedate the sixteenth century, the Mandaic bowls produced by the excavations in Mesopotamia are at least a millennium older. Pognon dated his bowls in the early days of the seventh century, the language showing slight traces of Arabic influence.¹⁶ Professor Montgomery, whose bowls showed no such influence, dated the Nippur texts about 600 A. D. The oldest Mandaic monument, the lead tablet published by Lidzbarski, is still earlier, as is shown by the script, and was dated by its publisher as early as the beginning of the fifth century.¹⁷ In the fourth place, the language of the Mandeans, an Aramaic dialect, closest to the dialect of the Talmud Babli, is by no means as degenerate and hence late as one might suppose at first glance, for the weakening of the laryngals and of the doubled letter so characteristic of the dialect can be attributed to local variation more readily than to degeneration, as earlier parallels show. Finally it can be demonstrated that while in certain texts the references to Mohammed are integral parts of late compositions, in others they are manifestly secondary additions to pre-Mohammedan tradition. As in the case

¹⁵ "Urchristentum u. Mandäismus," *ZNW.*, 1928, pp. 55-91, and particularly p. 62.

¹⁶ *Op. cit.*, pp. 14-15.

¹⁷ "Ein mandäisches Amulett," *Florilegium Melchior de Voguë*, 1910, pp. 349-375.

of the double nomenclature, like Yahya-Johana, the earlier Aramaic tradition is found to accommodate itself to the demands of the later Mohammedan era.

All of this makes it necessary to grant that the Mandaic sect existed before the Hejirah. The uncertainty regarding the Šabeans of the Koran then loses its decisiveness for the Mandaic question, and it can at least be regarded as possible that the Mandeans are included among those sectaries of whom the Koran speaks as Šabeans. Lagrange indeed suggests that the codification of the Mandaic tradition, most of which probably falls into the Mohammedan era, was caused by the Mandaean's need of a Holy Book from which it could be demonstrated that the sect shared in the divine revelation, and was thus entitled to toleration.

We have succeeded in tracing the Mandeans back to the sixth Christian century at least. In going on from that point we have two strands of evidence to follow, the outside evidence and that conveyed by the Mandaic texts. We turn first to the former.

3. In discussing the Šabeans, Chwolson asked the question whether the Šabeans of the Koran were identical with a sect called *Σεβουαῖοι* by Epiphanius.¹⁸ Memory of this sect can be shown to have existed in the ninth century from the rabbinical work *Halakoth Gedoloth*, where it appears with the name *יְבֻזִּי*. But memory alone is no guarantee of continued existence on the part of the sect, and besides the *Σεβουαῖοι* are apparently only of local Samaritan significance. Chwolson therefore correctly denied their relation to the later Šabeans.

Very little has ever been made of an excellent bit of testimony on the Mandeans furnished by Theodore bar Khoni (792 A. D.). Among the sects which he lists in his book of Scholia is one that he calls the Dostaiē. In telling of what they believe he apparently uses a written source, for his testimony is definite and precise. From what he tells us it is further evident that these Dostaiē are our Mandeans, or at least an offshoot from that sect. There is excellent evidence of this fact. First, the Dostaiē live in Mesene, where the modern Mandeans are found. Second, bar Khoni reports that in the district of Mesene these Dostaiē are known as Mandaïē. Third, he attributes to them the cosmogony of the Mandeans, the account agreeing with that of our Mandaic texts down to the very

¹⁸ *Adv. Haer.*, No. XI.

proper names of the *dramatis personae*, Abatur, Ptahil, Hibil, Dinanukht, etc.

I refer to bar Khoni at this point because in addition to a glimpse into the Mandaic theology he affords us what is to him a story of how the Mandaic sect came into being. The story is of sufficient value to quote in extenso. The passage begins with the superscription: "The Heresy of the Dostaiē which Adu the Beggar taught." Then it goes on as follows:

Adu, as they say, was from Adiabene and came as a beggar with his family to the district of Mesene. The name of his father was Dabda¹⁹ and that of his mother Em-Kushta, and those of his brothers Shilmai, Nidbai and Bar-Haije and Abizekha and Kushtai and Shithil. When they came to the river 'Ubi, they found a man whose name was Papa, son of Tinis, and they asked of him alms, according to their custom, and they persuaded him to take in to himself the indolent Adu on the plea that because of his sickness he was unable to beg. This Papa then turned him over to the guardians of the palm-trees. But when the guardians of the Palms declared concerning him: He is of no use to us, Papa built a shelter for him by the roadside, so that he might beg his sustenance of those travelling the highway. Finally his brethren met and came to his side and there they struck bells after the manner of beggars.

In Mesene they are called Mandaïē and Mashkenaiē and followers of those who do good things, and in²⁰ Beth Armaiē they are called Nazariē, and followers of Dostai. But the name that really fits them is Adonaiē. Their teaching is borrowed from the Markionaiē, Maninaïē and Kantaïē.²¹

Bar Khoni is usually well informed. His remarks on the Manichean cosmogony are about the best we have. With the accuracy of his tradition on the Mandaean cosmogony already conceded, we must admit that his story about Adu has the antecedent probability of being founded somehow in fact. Indeed the beggar Adu links up quite well with the stress of the value of alms-giving to which the Mandaic texts give testimony.

Only one or two things in the account require elucidation. In the first place the story is not really a narrative of the founding of the Mandaean sect. That is evident from the names of Adu's mother and brethren, Em Kushta, Shilmai, Nibdai, Bar-Haije, Kushtai and Shithil. To anyone familiar with the Mandaic texts all of these names are full of significance as the names of genii

¹⁹ Vocalization uncertain.

²⁰ The "in" is conjectural.

²¹ From the Syriac text in Pognon, *op. cit.*, p. 154.

who play important parts in the Mandaic theology. If but one of the names had such associations we might call it an accident. Now that six out of eight show such associations, we must suppose that Adu's parents were themselves already members of the Mandaic sect.

The tale that bar Khoni narrates to show the origin of the Mandeans is then really the story of how Adu and his brethren, coming from a Mandaic community in Adiabene, established a new basis for the sect in Mesene, in lower Mesopotamia.

The second thing to note in bar Khoni's narrative is that Adu and his brethren were not the only Mandeans engaged in this southward movement. It will be recalled that he speaks of a community established in Beth Armaiē the members of which are called Nazaraiē and Dostaiē. The names Mandaīē and Nasoraīē, as we know from the Mandaic texts, are the proper names of our religious sect. We must therefore suppose that just as the name Adonaiē, which bar Khoni proposes for them, merely perpetuates the proper name of the founder of the new community, so Dostaiē perpetuates the name of another missionary mendicant, Dostai or Dositheus, the founder of the community at Beth Armaiē.

The third thing in bar Khoni's account that requires elucidation is the statement to the effect that Mandaic theology is a combination of Marcionite, Manichean and Kantean doctrine.

That Mandaic theology had some connection with syncretism was the conjecture of the Orientalists of the last century to whom we are indebted for the philological investigation of the Mandaean tradition. Exactly what that connection might be no one dared to specify, first because the Orientalists did not feel competent to testify, and second because the texts themselves seemed to be so full of contradictions.²² When at the beginning of the twentieth century Hellenistic syncretism became a separate field of research, the mystery of the Mandaic theology began to clear up, or to deepen, whichever way one chooses to regard the ensuing developments.

Anz, studying the Gnostic conception of the heavenward journey of the soul, found that the Mandaic ideas of the achievement of immortality jibed perfectly with those of other Gnostic texts. Bousset, tracing the character of the Gnostic redeemer and the

²² Nöldeke, *Mandäische Grammatik*, p. xix.

Gnostic conceptions of the seven evil planets, the mother goddess and the primal man, was able to correlate western Gnostic and Mandaean ideas continually. Thus the relationship of Mandaeans and Gnostics, suggested by the Orientalists and already given in the name Mandaîē, which means Gnostics, was given a foundation in fact.

The acceptance of these conclusions signifies that in tracing back the history of the Mandaean sect, we are leaving the penumbra of the sixth century and that, to put it carefully, certain of the Mandaic doctrines at least appertain to a mode of religious thought that had its hey-day in the second and third Christian centuries.

The first question that arises in this connection is whether we can determine more precisely the exact place of Mandaean theology within the development of Gnostic thought. In trying to formulate an answer to this question we return to bar Khoni, and his statement that it represents a hodge-podge of Marcionite, Manichean and Kantean elements.

The first thing to be noted is that derivations such as that of bar Khoni are not to be taken too seriously. The stemmata with which the anti-heretical works abound scarcely ever stand the test or meet the requirements of the systems they embrace, for the criteria by which the ancient writers established the relationship of a given number of sects were usually quite external and insignificant.

To connect the Mandaeans and the Kantéans at all seems quite impossible. The little that bar Khoni himself tells us about the latter makes it evident that the similarity between them and the former exists in a common use of the Old Testament and a common reference to Old Testament characters, but not the same characters at that.

The Marcionites and the Mandaeans are more closely related, but in our opinion only apparently so. What they seem to share is a dualistic interpretation of creation. Like Marcion the Mandaeans sometimes speak of the creator Ptahil and his father Joshamin as evil or fallen spirits. The story goes that Joshamin, jealous of God his progenitor, determined to create a world for himself, that to this end he evoked Ptahil, who fashioned the cosmos, and that for this deed he and Ptahil were put in chains until the end of the world. That is good dualistic teaching, but it is an acquired tertiary element of the Mandaic tradition, for if we have read the

texts aright there is in them abundant evidence of another cosmogony, which, by reason of its intimate connection with the Mandaic conception of deity as Life, and by reason of its explanation of the nature and origin of Ptahil, must be considered more ancient and more truly Mandaic than that previously mentioned.

This earlier Mandaic cosmogony, with which we shall have to deal in extenso in another connection, operates with the primitive idea of the primordial egg, or *tanna*, "container" from the root *אנה*?, as it is called by the Mandaeans, and with the fruit that sprang from the egg. At the beginning, we are told, *הוא פירא בנו*, *פירא*, the Pira was in the Pira. Being interpreted this means that at the beginning the Pira, Hebrew *פֶּרִי*, the fruit, was in the Pira, Aramaic *פִּעִירָא*, Arabic *phagara*, the cleft, the *ἄπασον* or *ἀβύσσος* of fiery water. Within the egg were again fire and water, the symbolism being that of the yolk and white of the egg. A passage in the liturgies tells us how the fiery radiance within the Tanna melted the latter, and how, as a result of this melting, the water and the radiance within the egg were released and began to flow like a great river and mingle with the fiery water of the abyss.²³ From the heavenly stream, the great Jordan, there rises the fruit, or the Life, the deity that produces hypostases of itself by regarding its image in the water and calling this image forth into separate personal existence. The stream itself mingling with the fiery water of the abyss automatically creates the rest of cosmic existence in which are thus combined four elements, the radiance and water of the heavenly stream, and the radiance and water of the abyss. From the texts one can readily construct the nature of the combinations, heavenly water and abysmal radiance producing the firmament, heavenly radiance and abysmal radiance producing the stars, abysmal water and heavenly radiance producing the air, heavenly water and earthly water producing the earth, and all four elements combining to form man.

Although we are dealing in this cosmogony with two groups of elements, the cosmogony is not dualistic, since no value judgment is passed upon the abysmal elements by reason of the abyss's having produced the primordial egg in the first place. What is more important for our purpose is the realization that the opening of

²³ *Mand. Lit.*, p. 25.

the egg, which is the beginning of the process of creation, explains both the Mandaic use of פתחא in the sense of create, and the nature of Ptahil the creator, who is nothing more than the objectified process of creation, as his name clearly indicates when interpreted after the analogy of Hebrew פִּתְחִיָּהּ and יִפְתָּחֵהָ thus signifying "God opens or creates".

The primitive character of this monistic cosmogony and the explanation which it for the first time affords of the name and origin of Ptahil, shows that the dualistic interpretation previously mentioned has accrued to the Mandeans as the result of secondary Gnostic influences playing upon them from without. That being true we cannot connect them on this basis with the Marcionites, a fact that is borne out by the difference between the sects in their ethical outlook and their attitude toward Jesus.

When in 1904 the Manichean texts were unearthed in Turkestan the basis for the test of bar Khoni's third suggestion was made available. Anyone now comparing the two faiths, Mandaean and Manichean, will be struck by the similarities between them. Of common elements I need only mention the idea of a primordial conflict, of a heavenly primal man, of the heavenly origin and destiny of the soul, of a series of saviors, of a process of redemption which follows the analogy of the experience of the savior and of the personal relation of savior and soul.

The attempt has since been made by Scheftelowitz to derive Manichean doctrine from the Mandeans, the basis being the two statements of An-Nadim that the Mandeans were identical with the Mughtasila and that Mani's father was a convert to the sect of the Mughtasila. It soon became evident, however, that even if An-Nadim's statements are correct, the Mandaean religion is not the ultimate ancestor of the Manichean. The differences between them are too great to suppose that by any process of eclecticism one could from a Mandaean basis arrive at Manicheism. On the one hand we have monotheism, on the other dualism, on the one canons of twice five elements, on the other a canon of twice two, here a primordial conflict disassociated from the process of creation, there a primordial conflict directly responsible for the beginning of creation, here a victorious primordial champion and there a defeated champion.

These same differences, when taken together with the complete divergence in matters of cosmogony, where the Mandeans follow a

tradition otherwise connected with Phoenicia, while Mani follows that presented in the Bundahishn, can be used equally well to show that the Mandaean sect is not a direct outgrowth of Manicheism. The similarities between these two religions find other explanations than those of organic relationship. In part the similarities may be due to Manichean influence affecting the Mandaic sect. We have in another connection spoken of the Mandaean view of the relation of soul and savior as an instance of this kind of secondary dependence.

As has already been indicated, the Manicheans believe that the soul and the savior are related. Expressed in Manichean terminology the soul is the "self" or *grēv* of the savior, an idea to which only the intricacies of the Iranian discrimination in psychological matters could have given rise. The closest parallel to this conception outside Iranian and Manichean circles is found in certain Mandaic hymns where the savior is the heavenly counterpart or "image" of the soul.²⁴ Possibly we have here an echo of Manichean teaching, possibly also we have an independent parallel to the Manichean construction, more probably the Mandaean's own conception of the creation of beings endowed with personality as something that comes to pass through the perception of the image of deity reflected in the heavenly waters has produced this approximation to Manichean teaching.

Some of the similarities between Mandeans and Manicheans can thus possibly be explained by the hypothesis of Manichean influence playing upon the Mandaean sect, an hypothesis that does not lack probability by reason of the importance attaching to Manicheism in the later Orient. Other similarities will need to be explained on the hypothesis of a common dependence upon common Gnostic tradition. The primordial conflict is a case in point. In the Mandaean tradition it is vividly presented, but it has no bearing upon the ensuing creation and is thus a Gnostic curiosum rather than a part of the Mandaic theology. Another example is the soul's attitude toward the savior. The Mandaic texts actually give us two interpretations of the soul's attitude toward the savior. According to the one the soul is sleepy and needs to be awakened. According to the other she is awake and thirsting for information. In religious experience the two are not mutually exclusive. In

²⁴ *Ginza*, p. 559, lines 29-32.

theological systems they are. Of the two conceptions the one of the soul's being awake belongs to the optimistic view of life inherent in the cosmogony previously considered, in which the very processes of nature take care of the growth and development of things. The other, of the soul's being asleep, is then a secondary accretion. It could possibly be called Manichaen, for Mani has made it a part of his system, but since it appears also in other Gnostic faiths it might better be called broadly dualistic or gnostic.

The comparison of Mandeian theology in some of its elements with Marcionite and Manichean teaching has indicated that we should not take bar Khoni's derivation of Mandeian doctrine any more seriously than the derivations which heresiologists usually present. How he arrived at his impressions we can readily understand. There are similarities in each instance, but the similarities are not those of sects organically related.

The comparison of Mandeian, Marcionite and Manichean theology has a positive as well as this negative result, for in digging down through the débris deposited by successive waves of Gnostic influence upon the shore of the Mandeian texts, we have struck the rudiments of a cosmogony that has the earmarks of primitive thought, and that harks back to the traditions of the Orphic hymns, of Mochos and Sanchuniathon. In the present context we must refrain from following out this line of association and call attention rather to the difference between the Mandeian and the gnostic cosmogonies generally speaking.

Of those Gnostic sects with whom we happen to be familiar all except the Manicheans, who follow the Iranian tradition, and the Mandeans, have cosmogonies directly inspired by the Old Testament. Over and over again we hear how Elohim made the world and created man in his image. That being the case, the exceptions take on significance. We appear to be approaching the primitive non-Christian and non-Jewish elements of oriental syncretism.

Primitive elements appear frequently in the Mandaic texts. The Mandeian hero of the flood, Dinanukht, Avestan *daena-naokhda*, "he who observes the holy law", and of whom the Mandeans say that he sits to-day as the scribe, the learned one, surrounded by many waters, reflects the ancient Ut-Napishtim as Atra-Ḥasis much more potently than the biblical Noah. In the account of Hibil-Ziwa's descent to the underworld we have vivid reminiscences of Ishtar's journey and Marduk's battles with Tiamat and Kingu.

The Mandeans still use the old names of the planets, Shamesh, Libat (for Dilbat), Enbu (for Nabu), Sin, Kewan, Bel and Nirig (for Nergal). Even the old word *ekur*, once applied to sanctuaries, is preserved, being used by the Mandeans to designate the pagan shrines and the demons supposed to inhabit them.

The presence in Mandaic thought of so much that is primitive, and the lack of it in so many other Gnostic faiths, shows that in the Mandaic theology we are not dealing, as bar Khoni thought, with one of those artificial and arbitrary convictions common to the later stages of the Gnostic movement, but with a religion that wells up directly and spontaneously out of the subsoil of Oriental religious genius, and that may therefore well belong to the very beginning of the Gnostic era. Gressmann has coined for this type of Gnostic faith the name proto-Gnostic, a name that may well be used, provided it is not made the excuse for establishing a special epoch within the history of Gnosticism.

4. If the Mandaic texts embodied only Gnostic, or even proto-Gnostic elements of thought, we should have no further difficulty with them. We could suppose that the Mandeans were a second or third century product, and no one would feel hurt. Fortunately or unfortunately, the matter does not rest there, and we must go on to the second strand of the tradition at our disposal, the Mandeans' own statements regarding the antiquity and origin of their sect.

The living Mandaic tradition as reported to the French consul Siouffi by one who had been educated to the Mandaic priesthood, has it that the true Mandaic religion goes back to Adam. In the days between Adam and the beginning of the first Christian century the knowledge of this true faith was virtually lost. Then God sent John the Baptist to restore the lost faith, and John succeeded, a Naṣorean community being established by him in Jerusalem. To this community was attracted a Jewish princess, Maria (Mirjai in the texts). By reason of her conversion the Jews persecuted the Mandeans, killing all but Mirjai and a few youthful followers. At this moment the savior Anosh or Enosh appeared from heaven, destroying Jerusalem and leading Mirjai and the small remnant of the faithful to another spot. From here, where they again incur the hatred of the Jews, the remnant migrates to Shushtar in Persia.²⁵

²⁵ *Études sur la Religion des Soubbas*, Paris, 1880, pp. 1-31.

Much of this living Mandaic tradition is absolutely worthless, as is shown by the fact that it boldly transfers Moses to the days after John the Baptist. Yet some of its salient features are corroborated by Mandaic writ, for instance the conception that John the Baptist is connected with the movement, the idea of the conversion of Mirjai, the ensuing destruction of Jerusalem and the transfer of the sect from Palestine eastward, a transfer that leads it here directly to the Euphrates.

It is not important for us here to harmonize the discrepancies of the oral and written traditions, but it is important to note that both agree with bar Khoni in saying that the sect is not indigenous to lower Mesopotamia. For that we must needs be thankful. In corroborating bar Khoni, however, the Mandaic tradition goes beyond him in affirming that the ultimate home of the sect is not even Adiabene, but Palestine, and that the movement is connected with the work of John the Baptist. At this point we are not so sure whether to be grateful or no, for if the statements are taken at their face value, we have jumped from the days of Gnosticism and the world of Gnosticism to the Palestine of the early first century, a jump that no cautious historian is ready to make without circumspection.

In the matter of the Palestinian origin of the sect, which can be discussed apart from the hypothetical connection with the Baptist, the evidence does seem to favor the acceptance of the Mandaic tradition. A number of facts require consideration at this point. In the first place the Mandaic script is most closely akin to that of the Nabatean and Palmyrene inscriptions. The Mandaic codices, for instance, show the use of a small circle, like that of the Syriac *Waw* to indicate the letter *Aleph*. The only analogy is that of the Nabatean and Palmyrene inscriptions, where *aleph* is represented by a line ending in a small circle. The Mandaic codices lack the initial downward stroke, the line, but the lead amulet, published by Lidzbarski as the earliest Mandaic monument, still shows that line connected with the circle. There is further contact between the Nabateans and the Mandeans in the names of important genii like Nbat, who perhaps personifies the Nabateans or represents their eponym, and like Hauran and Hauraran, who either personify the Djebel Hauran or represent a deity connected with these mountains, such as that to which an ancient seal gives witness in recording the name עברחרן. Further north-Semitic affinities can be found

in the person and name of Joshamin, who recalls the famous Baalshamin²⁶ and in the female demon *היואת* who recalls the probably Phoenician goddess of the underworld that appears in the Carthaginian inscription as *היית*.²⁷ Lidzbarski has made much of the Palestinian provenience of parallels to the names of the two guardian spirits of the Jordan, Shilmai and Nidbai, a point on which he has been taken up by Lagrange, who showed the Mesopotamian occurrence of *Σελαμάνης*.²⁸ Finally Lidzbarski has called attention to the west-Semitic form of the words by which the Mandeans designate two of their most important religious concepts, namely, the forms *מאנרא* for *מדיע* and *כושתא* for *קישטא*.

In an era of syncretism the argument from the occurrence of north and west Semitic forms and names in the Mandaic idiom is rather weak. We have therefore to fall back on the Mandaic script and the equally significant Mandaic use of the name Jordan. The Mandeans call every stream of running water Jordan, supposing that all running water comes down from heaven in the mountains of the north and flows over the earth until it enters the bowels of the earth through a great cleft. While the uniqueness of the natural phenomena furnished by the Jordan's terminating in the Dead Sea might possibly lead even Mesopotamian sectaries to harbor such a description of the river as the Mandaic texts give, it is hard to believe that the Mandaean sect if it had been born on the banks of the Euphrates or the Zab would in its ubiquitous use of the name Jordan have so completely submerged the tradition concerning its own local rivers.

These are the arguments for the Palestinian origin of the Mandaic sect that can be considered apart from the problem of its connection with the Baptist. As their acceptance by Lagrange indicates, they will require serious consideration. At the same time it must be observed that if the origin of the Mandeans lie in Palestine, a distinction will need to be made between the religious beliefs of the sect in Palestinian and Mesopotamian days. The failure of the German scholars to make this distinction has led to misapprehensions of disastrous nature, as will appear shortly.

²⁶ Baudissin, *Adonis u. Esmun*, 1911, p. 26.

²⁷ Lagrange, "La Gnose mandéenne et la tradition evangelique," *Revue Biblique*, 1927-28, pp. 321-249; 481-515; 5-36, esp. 1927, p. 486.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 485. The name occurs also in the Greek inscriptions of Syria, cf. *Syria, Reports of the Princeton Archaeological Expedition*, III B, p. 7 et al.

If we were to take the Mandeans at their word when they tell us that they are the disciples of John the Baptist, there would be no need of arguing about their Palestinian origin. But can we really accept their contention? That is the next question to be considered.

That baptismal lustrations form one of the central if not the central element in Mandaic teaching and practice will require no proof. Because of its centrality it will undoubtedly refer to the very earliest stages of the Mandaic movement. The same thing is not true of the bulk of the tradition about the person of the Baptist. As the casual reader of the *Sidra d'Yahya* will soon note, the Mandaic stories concerning John merely repeat the facts of Gospel narrative, clothing them in a garment of legendary expatiation such as one finds in the Syriac *Life of John the Baptist* recently published by Mingana in the *Woodbrooke Studies*.²⁹

While they would probably grant this impression concerning the great bulk of the tradition on John to be correct, Reitzenstein and Lidzbarski none the less point to certain of its elements as evidence of an accuracy of viewpoint only to be achieved among bona fide disciples of the Baptist. In presenting their views we shall try to steer clear of the theological side of the argument.

The first item on the list is a matter of terminology. As we have already seen, the Mandeans speak of themselves both as Mandeans and as Naṣoreans. The first of these names identifies them as Gnostics, being derived from the root נִרְעָ. The second was the basis of their once being called a Christian sect, a view which, as we have seen, was erroneous. Now the closest parallel to the Mandaic נַחְשֹׁרַיָא is found in the name Ναζωπαῖος applied by the writers of Matthew, John and Luke-Acts to Jesus. Of these Christian authors only Matthew offers an explanation of the significance of the name when he tells us that through Jesus' residence at Nazareth was fulfilled the Scripture which says he shall be called Ναζωπαῖος. The point he makes is that Ναζωπαῖος is a gentile noun derived from Ναζαρέθ. Lidzbarski, who first took the matter in hand, pointed out that the normal gentile formation from the name Ναζαρέθ would be either Ναζαρηνός or Ναζαπαῖος, both of which appear in the pages of the New Testament, Ναζωπαῖος requiring the place-name to be Ναζωρέθ, a form not otherwise preserved. The conclusion is that Matthew's derivation is like most

²⁹ Cambridge, 1927.

such derivations, secondary and artificial. Anyone regarding the New Testament *Naẓapaïos* and the Mandaic נאצוראִיא quite apart from Matthews' hypothesis would normally identify them as the Greek and Mandaic forms of an Aramaic *nomen agentis* derived from the root נצר after the analogy of Aramaic אמוראה and סאבוראה the well-known names of two groups of Talmudists, derived from the roots אכר and סכר, respectively. Greek *Naẓapaïos* and Mandaic נאצוראִיא thus really signify "the observant", probably in some technically religious sense. Since this name cannot have been coined for Jesus, as is shown by his liberal attitude toward observance and by the failure of his disciples to understand it, it will have accrued to him most probably, so we are told, from his associations with the more ascetic and observant John the Baptist. Hence its perpetuation in Mandaic circles, as one of the names of the Mandaic sect, indicates that in this particular their tradition is more than merely correct, it is even corrective of the New Testament. The Mandeans must be the true disciples of John to preserve so excellent a tradition.

The second item quoted in support of the Mandeans' true connection with the Baptist is a matter of perspective. As we have already seen, the Mandeans are hostile to both Jews and Christians. In this respect, says Reitzenstein, they preserve a primitive antithesis. It has long been evident that the latter New Testament tradition, particularly that of the Fourth Evangelist, strives consciously to minimize the significance of the Baptist. To explain this fact it has long been assumed that some of the Baptist's disciples, failing to go over to Jesus, perpetuated his message as an autonomous gospel, thus rivalling the early Christian movement and occasioning the polemical treatment of their teacher. The Mandaic tradition, opposing the religion of Jesus as well as that of the Jews, thus preserves the attitude which the true disciples of John were conjectured to have assumed.

The third item to be mentioned concerns a matter of practice, namely, the matter of Baptism and its significance. To the discussion of this item Reitzenstein has dedicated his most recent publication, "Die Vorgeschichte der christlichen Taufe" (1929), one of those intricate mosaics of German scholarship over which one can but marvel and toil. In the Mandaic act of Baptism as known from its liturgy, says Reitzenstein, we have something in the nature of a mystery-rite, mediating forgiveness and mystical

elevation into heaven, now transformed into a rite of initiation. Turning to the corresponding Christian practice, Reitzenstein finds that the interpretations of its significance vary, from the idea that baptism conveys the Spirit (Acts) to the idea that in it one dies with Christ (Paul) and to that of rebirth (John). Of these ideas the first is certainly secondary by reason of Acts' well-known uncertainty as to just how Baptism and Spirit are connected. More significant to Reitzenstein is the fact that though Jesus never baptized, his disciples apparently inaugurated the practice immediately after their Easter experiences. He feels that there must have been something in the baptism of John which made the reception of the sacrament cogent to the disciples once Jesus was no longer with them. This, he finds, cannot be the idea of forgiveness, an idea common to Mandaic, Baptist and Christian rites, nor the idea of sonship or rebirth, for of both forgiveness and sonship the disciples were already aware before Jesus' death. It must therefore lie in the idea of initiation into, or personal identification with an existing group, and in the conception that in the rite the individual shares in the resurrection of Christ; in other words, experiences in a mystical way the elevation which follows upon his death. But this primitive Christian conception of baptism borrowed from John in its fundamental outlines is identical with that found in the Mandaic liturgies, where, as we have said, we get a rite mediating forgiveness and mystical elevation into heaven, all transformed into an initiatory practice. Hence the Mandaean rite is that of John and the origin of the Christian practice.

Let us scrutinize these contentions of Lidzbarski and Reitzenstein.

In his treatment of the name *Naζωπαῖος* Lidzbarski has been opposed by Dalman and others who have felt that there is a possible transition from Mandaic נַצְוֹרֵאִיא or Aramaic נְצִיָּרִי to a *kātūl* form נְצֹרֵת of the *kātīl* נְצִרֵת that lies behind the name *Naζαρέθ*.³⁰ Yet the importance of the a-o vowel combination as an indication of nomen agentis forms, and the fact that both the participle נְצִר and the nomen agentis form נְצִיָּר, which between them satisfy all three New Testament forms *Naζαπαῖος*, *Naζαρηγος* and *Naζωπαῖος*, can be construed as legitimate Aramaic renditions

³⁰ Dalman, *Aramäische Grammatik*, 1905, pp. 178 and 152.

of Hebrew נָצִיר, which gives us the Talmudic נָצְרִי applied to the Christians lead me personally to prefer to accept Lidzbarski's contention and to suppose that the name Ναζωραῖος has nothing to do with Ναζαρέθ, and most probably means "the observant one". If we take this step, we must, however, take one more and admit with Lidzbarski that the name was not coined for Jesus, but came to him through his association with the Baptist's or other circles. But this does not necessarily lead to the third step, of supposing that the Mandeans, since they preserve the name in one of its possible forms, are the true disciples of the Baptist. In the first place the use of the name Nazarene is not limited to the disciples of John and the Christians properly speaking, but is used also by at least two Christian sects of whom Epiphanius speaks.³¹ In the second place, even on the hypothesis that the name came to the Mandeans by way of the Baptist, it does not necessarily follow that it came directly and at first hand.

The same thing holds true of the so-called reception of the Baptist antithesis to Judaism and Christianity. Personally we do not feel that this antithesis was engendered in connection with the movement of John, but even supposing that it had been, it would not need to have come to them directly. The reason is that the Christians and the immediate disciples of John were not the only ones to claim connection with the figure of the Baptist. Dositheus and Simon Magus at least registered similar claims. Why they should do so is as evident as why the Gnostics should almost without exception seize upon the figure of Jesus as the savior. The vitality of the person and the importance of the movement associated with it made the claim to association valuable. If that is true for Simon Magus it will be more than true for a baptizing sect such as that of the Mandeans.

What the occasion of the claim may have been is a matter of secondary importance. We know that disciples of John, such as Paul may have met at Ephesus, continued to circulate Johannine teaching in some form or other, and personally we should be inclined to suppose that the importance which accrues to John in Mandaic tradition is the result of some contact with individuals carelessly perpetuating the movement he began. Here we find

³¹ *Adv. Haer.*, No. XIX, 1, 3, 4, and XXX, 3.

another argument for the Palestinian origin of the sect, but not an argument for immediate dependence upon the Baptist.

Reitzenstein's treatment of Baptism, Mandaic, Johannine and Christian is a blend of invaluable and hazardous suggestions. That the idea of initiation into or personal identification with a definite group may have had something to do with the reception of baptism by the early church is quite possible. That in baptism the first Christians experienced the resurrection of Jesus is quite improbable. This experience comes to the early Church through the paradosis and through the witness of the apostles, who are chosen in the narrower sense because of their ability to testify on this subject. Paul's idea of dying with Christ in baptism is certainly mystical and in some form it may by reason of Jesus' words to the Sons of Zebedee go back to the most primitive tradition. But dying with Christ is not the same as experiencing a mystical elevation into heaven, and the latter is in the New Testament regarded rather as a future hope than as a present achievement.

With all that it is a relief to find someone who, like Reitzenstein, can discuss the subject of Christian baptism and forget the irrelevant topics of the Hellenistic taurobolia and criobolia as well as the equally irrelevant Jewish proselyte lustrations. Personally we should be inclined to agree with Reitzenstein's general position that the key to the origin of Johannine and Christian baptism will be found in the religious practices of Palestinian baptist sects. By that we do not mean that we must seek its prototype in India, Iran or even pure paganism. All of the Palestinian baptist sects, so far as we are familiar with them, were strongly under the influence of Judaism, and what they show of non-Jewish thought is essentially Semitic rather than Iranian. That the Mandeans have something to contribute in this connection is more than possible, but it is a subject that is theological rather than historical and hence belongs in another context.

As their religious traditions, their script and their use of north and west Semitic forms and names indicate, the Mandaean sect probably did originate in Palestine, the home of other baptist communities. And, while the facts of the case make it improbable that John the Baptist was directly constitutive of their community, they none the less indicate the occurrence of what was for the Mandeans an important contact with circles or individuals perpetuating in one form or other something of the movement of John.

The anti-baptist polemic of the Fourth Gospel indicates that the Mandeans could have come into contact with the followers of John even in the early second century. All that can therefore be said regarding the antiquity of the Mandeans is that, as a sect, they are not without first century affinities.

A BIBLIOGRAPHY ON THE MANDEANS, 1926-1929.

English.

- Pallis, S. A., *Mandean Studies*, Oxford, 1926. (2 ed. of a Norwegian work.)
 Howard, W. F., *The Fourth Gospel and the Mandean Gnosticism*, London Quarterly Review, 1927, pp. 72-85.
 Burkitt, F. C., *The Mandeans*, *Jour. Theol. Studies*, XXIX, 1928, pp. 225-235.
 ———, Note on Ginza Rabba, 174, *ibid.*, pp. 235-237.

French.

- Lagrange, Fr. M. J., *La Gnose mandéenne et la tradition evangelique*, *Revue biblique*, XXXVI, 1927, pp. 321-249, 481-515; XXXVII, 1928, pp. 5-36.

German.

- Peterson, E., *Bemerkungen zur mandäischen Literatur*, *ZNW*, XXV, 1926, pp. 236-248.
 Reitzenstein R. u. Schaeder, H. H., *Studien zum antiken Synkretismus aus Iran u. Griechenland*, Leipzig, 1926.
 ———, *Hellenistische Mysterienreligionen*, 3 ed., 1927.
 ———, *Zur Mandäerfrage*, *ZNW.*, XXVI, 1927, pp. 39-70.
 Lidzbarski, M., *Mandäische Fragen*, *ZNW.*, XXVI, 1927, pp. 70-75.
 Büchsel, F., *Mandäer u. Johannesjünger*, *ZNW.*, XXVI, 1927, pp. 219-231.
 Behm, J., *Die mandäische Religion u. d. Christentum*, Deichert, 1927.
 Schaeder, H. H., *Zur Mandäerfrage*, *Orient. Lit. ztg.*, XXI, 1928, pp. 163 ff.
 Peterson, E., *Urchristentum und Mandäismus*, *ZNW.*, XXVII, 1928, pp. 55-98.
 Lidzbarski, M., *Alter u. Heimat der mandäischen Religion*, *ibid.*, pp. 321-327.
 Peterson, E., *Der gegenwärtige Stand der Mandäerfrage*, *Theol. Blätter*, VII, 1928, pp. 317-323.
 Preisker, H., *Urchristlicher u. mandäischer Erlösungsglaube*, *Theol. Blätter*, VII, 1928, pp. 143-151.
 Reitzenstein, R., *Die Vorgeschichte der christlichen Taufe*, 1929.

EARLIER PUBLICATIONS NOT PREVIOUSLY LISTED.

Arabic (not accessible at the U. of P. Library).

- R. P. Anastase-Marie of Bagdad, a series of articles in *Al-Machriq*, III, 1900, pp. 486-89; 680-685; 777-785.
 IV, 1901, pp. 400-406; 550-554; 684-689; 779-785.
 V, 1902, pp. 392-396; 488-496.

ARABIC, PERSIAN AND TURKISH MANUSCRIPTS IN THE COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

NICHOLAS N. MARTINOVITCH
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

AFTER the publication of my catalogue of the Turkish and Persian manuscripts in the Princeton University Library in 1926, I began the same work with the manuscripts belonging to Columbia University. Because of the lack of time, my description is not detailed. Though the collection in question is small—only 47 manuscripts¹—nevertheless I believe that specialists will find among them some rare, important, and interesting items.

The titles of the works and the names of the authors and calligraphers are given in the usual system of transliteration adopted by the International Congress of Orientalists. The numbers are followed by the class-marks of the Library. As regards the measurements, the numerals give the size, in inches, of the whole sheets and of the written space. The bindings are described only if they are of artistic value.

No. 1

X893.7 K843

Arabic.

Qur'ān.

Size $9 \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ and $7 \times 4\frac{1}{2}$.

Folios 355. Written in naskhī. 12 lines to a page. Gold and blue-ruled margins and two richly decorated 'unwāns. Red titles.

Cream-colored paper. Brown and red leather binding, both sides embossed.

Date, f. 353 b: The First Rabi' 976 A. H. (September, 1568 A. D.)

No. 2

X893.7 K841

Arabic.

Qur'ān.

Size $8\frac{1}{4} \times 6$ and $6 \times 2\frac{3}{4}$.

¹ Besides them, one manuscript was described by the late A. Yohannan, *J. A. O. S.*, vol. 23, p. 102.

Folios 286. Written in naskhī. 15 lines to a page. Blue and red-ruled margins and two 'unwāns. Cream-colored paper.

Date and name of copyist, f. 286 b: Muḥammad Sa'īd b. Jārallāh al-Muqaddasī, 1238 A. H. (1822-3 A. D.)

No. 3

X893.7 K84

Arabic.

Qur'ān.

Size 9 x 6½ and 7 x 5.

Folios 71. Written in naskhī. 13 lines to a page. Red titles.

Yellow paper. The manuscript is put in a wooden box.

Undated.

A part of Koran; chapters 4, 9, 13, 14, 15, 16, 25.

No. 4

X893.7 K84

Arabic—Persian.

Qur'ān.

Size 9 x 6½ and 7 x 4½.

Folios 199. Written in naskhī. 22 lines to a page. The Arabic text is written in black, the Persian—in red. The beginning is missing.

Undated.

A part of Koran (from the chapter 10) with Persian translation.

No. 5

X893.7 K842 Q

Arabic.

Anwār at-Tanzīl by Baiḍāwī.

Size 12 x 8½ and 8½ x 5.

Folios 470. Written in small naskhī. 25 lines to a page. Red titles. Yellowish paper. Red leather binding, embossed outside.

Date and name of copyist, f. 469 b: Ibrāhīm, the First Jumādā 1063 A. H. (April, 1653 A. D.)

A well-known commentary upon the Koran entitled Anwār at-Tanzīl wa Asrār at-Ta'wīl by 'Abdallāh b. 'Omar al-Baiḍāwī, d. 685 A. H. (1286 A. D.)

Brockelmann, *Gesch. d. Arab. Lit.* I, 417, with *Asrār* instead of *Anwār*.

No. 6

X893.7 K84 M28

Arabic.

Gharīb al-Qurʿān by al-Mājiṣī.

Size $7 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ and 6×4 .

Folios 28. Written in *maghribī*. 13 lines to a page. White paper. Undated.

A poetical commentary upon the Koran by Shaikh Abū ʿAbdallāh Muḥammad b. ʿAbdallāh al-Mājiṣī (?). Cf. Brockelmann I, 105.

No. 7

X893.7 K846

Arabic.

Sharḥ al-Qawāʿid by Muḥammad Raūf.

Size $8\frac{1}{2} \times 6$ and $5\frac{1}{2} \times 4$.

Folios 75. Written in *naskhī*. 15 lines to a page. White paper.

Date and name (autograph of the author), f. 75 a: Muḥammad Raūf b. Mullā Ismāʿīl, Saturday, The last day of Dhū-l-Hijjah 1314 A. H. (May 29, 1897 A. D.)

A commentary on *al-Qawāʿid al-Muqarrarah*, the treatise on the Koran readings by Muḥammad b. Qāsim al-Baqarī, d. 1111 A. H. (1699 A. D.) Brockelmann, II, 327.

No. 8

X893.7 Sh2

Arabic.

ash-Shāṭibiyah.

Size 8×6 and 6×4 .

Folios 37. Written in *naskhī*. 17 lines to a page in two columns. Red titles. Cream-colored paper.

Date and name of copyist, f. 37 a: Dāūd al-Nklāwī, Sunday, Muḥarram 8, 1101 A. H. (October 22, 1689 A. D.)

A part of the poetical treatise on the Koran by al-Qāsim b. Firruh ash-Shāṭibī, d. 590 A. H. (1194 A. D.) Brockelmann, I, 409.

No. 9

X893.7 G34 V5

Arabic.

Radd ʿalā Ahl adh-Dhimma by al-Wāṣiṭī.

Size $6\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ and $5 \times 3\frac{1}{2}$.

Folios 37. Written in naskhī. 13 lines to a page. Gold titles.

Yellowish paper. The end is missing.

Dates of owner, f. f. 3 b and 36 a: 1178 A. H. (1764 A. D.)

A treatise on theology by al-Wāsiṭī (?).

No. 10

X893.7 M72

Arabic.

‘Aqīdah by as-Sanūsī.

Size $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ and $6\frac{1}{2} \times 4$.

Folios 6. Written in naskhī. 14-15 lines to a page. Yellow paper.

Undated.

‘Aqīdat Ahl at-Tauhīd as Ṣughrà, the abbreviation of a treatise on theology by Muḥammad b. Yūsuf as-Sanūsī, d. 892 A. H. (1487 A. D.) Brockelmann, II, 250.

No. 11

X893.7 M58

Arabic—Persian.

Miftāḥ al-Falāḥ by al-‘Āmilī.

Size $8\frac{1}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ and $5\frac{1}{2} \times 2\frac{1}{2}$.

Folios 112. The Arabic text is written in black naskhī, the Persian—in red nasta‘līq. 20 lines to a page. Gold ruled margins. Red leather binding, outside embossed with gold.

Date and name of owner, f. 2 a: ‘Abdallāh Zain al-‘Ābidīn, 1104 A. H. (1693 A. D.)

A collection of Mohammedan prayers by Bahā ad-Dīn Muḥammad al-‘Āmilī, d. 1030 A. H. (1621 A. D.), translated into Persian by Jamāl ad-Dīn Muḥammad b. Ḥusain Khwānsārī. Brockelmann, II, 414; Rieu, Brit. Mus. Pers. Suppl. 8.

No. 12

X893.794 M72

Arabic—Turkish.

Untitled prayer book.

Size $4 \times 2\frac{3}{4}$ and $2\frac{1}{4} \times 1\frac{1}{2}$.

Folios 109. Modern European writing. 9 lines to a page. White paper. Black leather binding, outside embossed with gold.

Undated.

A collection of Mohammedan prayers with Turkish commentary,
by an unknown author.

No. 13

X893.7 M723

Arabic.

ash-Shifā by Yaḥṣubī.

Size $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ and $6 \times 3\frac{1}{2}$.

Folios 254. Written in naskhī. 17 lines to a page. Yellowish
paper.

Name of copyist, f. 253 b: Mas'ūd b. Ḥusain ad-Dauraqī.

A biography of the prophet Muḥammad, entitled ash-Shifā fi
Ta'rīf Ḥuqūq al-Muṣṭafā, by 'Iyād b. Mūsā al-Yaḥṣubī, d. 544
A. H. (1149 A. D.) Brockelmann, I, 369.

No. 14

X893.7 M722

Arabic.

Maulid an-Nabī.

Size 8×5 and $6 \times 4\frac{1}{2}$.

Folios 12. Written in small naskhī. 19 lines to a page. White
paper.

Undated, modern.

A small treatise on the birth of the prophet Muḥammad by an
unknown author.

No. 15

X893.7 N14

Arabic.

Nuhzat at-Tadhkirah by ash-Shādhilī.

Size $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ and $5 \times 3\frac{1}{2}$.

Folios 34. Written in naskhī. 21 lines to a page. Yellow paper.

Date, f. 34 b: finished by the author on Saturday, The Second
Jumādā 12, 779 A. H. (October 16, 1377 A. D.) in Mecca.

A treatise on sufism, entitled Nuhzat at-Tadhkirah wa Nuzhat at-
Tabṣīrah, by Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. 'Alī ash-
Shādhilī. Cf. Ahlwardt, Arab. Handschr. Berlin, No. 3030,
with the title: Risālah fī-t-Taṣawwuf.

No. 16

X893.7 T87

Arabic.

al-Mabsūṭ by Ṭūsī.

Size $11\frac{1}{2} \times 7$ and $8\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$.

Folios 376. Written in ta'liq. 29 lines to a page. Red titles.
Yellowish paper.

Undated.

Kitāb al-Mabsūṭ fi-l-Fiqh, a digest of Mohammedan law, by Abū
Ja'far Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan at-Ṭūsī, d. 459 A. H. (1067
A. D.)

Brockelmann, I, 405.

No. 17

X893.7 K11

Arabic.

Jāmi' al-Fuṣūlain by Simāwnah Oghlī.

Size 10×7 and $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$.

Folios 291. Written in naskhī. 29-31 lines to a page. Red titles.
Cream-colored paper. Brown leather binding, embossed out-
side.

Date, f. 291 a: Friday, The First Jumādā 12, 935 A. H. (Janu-
ary 22, 1529 A. D.)

Jāmi' al-Fuṣūlain fi-l-Furū', a juridical manual, by Badr ad-Dīn
Maḥmūd Simāwnah Oghlī, d. c. 818 A. H. (1415 A. D.)
Brockelmann, II, 225.

No. 18

X893.712 H

Arabic.

Tarjumah Khuṭbah Hrūsūs (sic!)

Size $11 \times 7\frac{1}{2}$ and $9 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$.

Folios 123. Written in maghribī. 26 lines to a page. Yellow
paper. The end is missing. Red leather binding, embossed
outside.

Undated.

This manuscript was written in North-Western Africa, and is an
anonymous Arabic translation of an unknown European treat-
ise on the history of the world from the earliest times to the
reign of the Emperor Constantius, the son of Constantine The
Great. It is possible that we have here the translation of a
work of the historian Martin Crusius, 1526-1607 (our manu-
script: Hrusius), especially because some of his works were
entitled "orationes", and our translation has as a title
"Khuṭbah", i. e. speech, sermon. Unfortunately, I have been

unable to identify the work of Crusius, from which our copy has been translated.

No. 19

X893.7 Ib66

Arabic.

Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq by Ibn 'Asākir.

Size $10\frac{1}{2}$ x 7 and $7\frac{1}{2}$ x 5.

Folios 203. Old Syrian writing, partly without diacritic points.

24-26 lines to a page. Dark yellow restored paper.

Date, f. f. 23 a, 64 a, 81 a: 619 A. H. (1222 A. D.)

A part (chapters 325-333) of the history of the city of Damascus (biographies of the famous Damascians) by Abū-l-Qāsim 'Alī b. al-Ḥasan b. 'Asākir, d. 571 A. H. (1176 A. D.) Brockelmann, I, 331.

No. 20

X893.7 Is1

Arabic.

Sahm al-Muṣīb by 'Isā Aiyūbī.

Size 8 x 6 and $6\frac{1}{2}$ x 4.

Folios 138. Written in naskhī. 15 lines to a page. Cream-colored paper.

Date and name of copyist, f. 138 a: 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib b. al-Ḥusain, 623 A. H. (! before the death of the author!) (1226 A. D.)

The full title is: Sahm al-Muṣīb fī-r-Radd 'alā-l-Khaṭīb (The title-page of our manuscript has: fī Kabd al-Khaṭīb). It is a polemical historical work by 'Isā b. Abī Bakr, Sultan of the Aiyubid dynasty in Damascus d. 624 A. H. (1227 A. D.) written against "The History of Baghdad" of al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī. Brockelmann, II, 698.

No. 21

X893.7 K522

Arabic.

Wafayāt al-A'yān by Ibn Khallikān.

Size 11 x 8 and 9 x 6.

Folios 149. Written in maghribī. 24-27 lines to a page. Yellowish paper. The beginning and end are missing. Red leather binding, embossed outside.

Date, f. 88 b: finished in the city Aṣīlā on Wednesday, Dhū-l-Qa'dah 7, 1007 A. H. (June 1, 1598 A. D.)

An abridgement of the well-known biographical dictionary entitled
Wafayāt al-A'yān wa Anbā Abnā az-Zamān by Shams ad-Dīn
 Abū-l-'Abbās Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Khallikān, d. 681 A. H.
 (1282 A. D.) Brockelmann, I, 327.

No. 22

X893.7 K52

Arabic.

Wafayāt al-A'yān by Ibn Khallikān.Size 10×7 and $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$.

Folios 310. Written in naskhī. 23 lines to a page. Red titles.

Yellowish paper. Brown leather binding, embossed outside.

Date, f. 310 b: Dhū-l-Qa'dah 27, 814 A. H. (March 12, 1412 A. D.)

The first volume of *Wafayāt*. Cf. No. 21.

No. 23

X893.7 Ib67

Arabic.

Akhbār al-Adhkiyā by al-Jauzī.Size $9\frac{1}{2} \times 7$ and 7×4 .

Folios 100. Written in naskhī. 27 lines to a page. Cream-colored paper.

Date, f. 100 a: 1091 A. H. (1680 A. D.)

Kitāb fī Akhbār al-Adhkiyā, a collection of the biographies, by
 'Abd ar-Raḥmān al-Jauzī, d. 597 A. H. (1200 A. D.) Brock-
 elmann, I, 503.

No. 24

X893.7 N17

Arabic.

Al-Ḥimyarīyah by Nashwān.Size $9 \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ and $5\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$.

Folios 211. Written in naskhī. 15 lines to a page. Blue titles.

White paper. Red leather binding, outside embossed with silver.

Date and name of copyist, f. f. 206 ab: finished in 'Omān by Abū
 Sālim 'Ubaidallāh b. Farḥān, on Friday, the First Jumādā 13,
 1313 A. H. (November 1, 1895 A. D.) *Al-Qaṣīdat al-*
Ḥimyarīyah, a poetical work dealing with the historical tradi-
 tions of the Southern Arabia, by Nashwān (from this first

name of the author another title of this work is derived: an—
Nashwānīyah) b. Saʿīd al-Ḥimyarī (from which name our title
is derived), d. 573 A. H. (1177 A. D.) Brockelmann, I,
300, 301.

No. 25

X893.7 Z2

Arabic.

Rabīʿ al-Abrār by Zamakhsharī.

Size 11 x 7½ and 9 x 5½.

Folios 220. Written in naskhī. 27-31 lines to a page. Red titles.

Cream-colored paper. The end is missing.

Undated.

The second part of Rabīʿ al-Abrār, a collection of proverbs, sayings,
verses, etc., by Abū-l-Qāsim Maḥmūd b. ʿOmar az-Zamakhsharī,
d. 538 A. H. (1143 A. D.) Brockelmann, I, 292.

No. 26

X893.7 Sa2

Arabic.

Sīrat Dhī Yazan.

Size 9 x 6½ and 7 x 5.

Folios 169. Modern (European?) writing. White paper.

Date, f. 169 a: Ramaḍān 20, 1236 A. H. (June 21, 1821 A. D.)

Sīrat al-Malik Saif Dhī Yazan, popular stories concerning the
adventures of the old heroes of Yaman. Brockelmann, II, 62.
Ahlwardt, Nos. 9119-9122.

No. 27

X893.7 M98

Arabic.

Majmūʿah.

Size 8 x 6 and 7¾ x 5.

Folios 18. Written in naskhī. White paper.

Undated.

An anonymous collection of Arabic verses.

No. 28

X893.7 Sa3

Arabic.

Majmūʿah.

Size 6 x 4.

Folios 31. Different writings. Yellowish paper.

Undated, modern.

An anonymous collection of Arabic verses.

No. 29

X893.782 C68

Arabic.

Majmū'ah.

Size $6\frac{1}{2}$ x $4\frac{1}{2}$ and 5 x 3.

Folios 30. Written in small, black and red, naskhī. Cream-colored paper. The beginning and end are missing. Modern European binding.

Undated.

An anonymous collection of Arabic popular songs.

No. 30

X893.7 N18

Arabic.

Nawādir Naṣr ad-Dīn.

Size 8 x 5 and 6 x $4\frac{1}{2}$.

Folios 84. Written in small naskhī. 19 lines to a page. White paper.

Undated, modern.

Name of copyist, f. 1 a: Yūsuf Shīshah. An anonymous Arabic translation of the Turkish anecdotes of the famous Khwājah Naṣr ad-Dīn Afandī.

No. 31

X893.741 Ex1

Arabic.

Majmū'ah.

Size $6\frac{1}{2}$ x $4\frac{1}{2}$.

Folios 30. Written in roq'ah. Yellowish paper.

Undated, modern.

A collection of Arabic private letters, documents, separate verses, etc.

No. 32

X893.7 Sa5

Arabic.

al-Muqaddamat al-Ājurrūmiyah.

Size $8 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ and 5×3 .

Folios 8. Written in naskhī. 11 lines to a page. Red titles.

White paper.

Undated.

The beginning of *al-Muqaddamat al-Ājurrūmiyah*, a grammatical work by Muḥammad b. Dāūd as-Sanhājī b. Ājurrūm (from this name the title is derived), d. 723 A. H. (1323 A. D.) Brockelmann, II, 237.

No. 33

X893.7 Ib63

Arabic.

Qaṭr an-Nadā by Ibn Hishām.

Size $8\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ and $6 \times 3\frac{1}{2}$.

Folios 88. Written in roq'ah. 17 lines to a page. Cream-colored paper. Red leather binding.

Undated, modern.

A portion of the treatise on Arabic grammar, with a commentary, entitled *Qaṭr an-Nadā wa Ball as-Ṣadā* by 'Abdallāh b. Yūsuf b. Hishām, d. 761 A. H. (1360 A. D.) Brockelmann, II, 23.

No. 34

X893.7 J24

Arabic.

al-Farāīd ad-Diyāīyah by Jāmī.

Size $9\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ and $6\frac{1}{4} \times 3\frac{1}{4}$.

Folios 245. Written in nasta'liq. 15 lines to a page. Red ruled margins and an 'unwān. Red titles. Cream-colored paper.

Date and name of the author, f. 244 b: finished (autograph?!) by 'Abd ar-Raḥmān Jāmī, Ramaḍān 23, 897 A. H. (July 19, 1492 A. D.)

A commentary on the grammatical work *al-Kafīyah* by Ibn al-Ḥājib, d. 646 A. H. (1248 A. D.) Usually this commentary is called *al-Fawāīd*; Brockelmann, II, 207 and our copy have *al-Farāīd*. The author of this commentary is the famous Persian poet and philosopher 'Abd ar-Raḥmān Jāmī, d. 898 A. H. (1492 A. D.), who composed it for his son Diyā ad-Dīn, from whose name the title is derived. Browne, *Hist. Pers. Lit.*, III, 514. Brockelmann, I, 304, II, 207. Ahlwardt, No. 6575.

No. 35

X893.7 Ib64

Arabic.

Auḍaḥ by Ibn Hishām.

Size 9 x 6½ and 5½ x 3.

Folios 200. Written in naskhī. 15 lines to a page. Red titles.

Cream-colored paper.

Undated.

Our copy is entitled *Matn at-Tauḍīḥ*, but the full title of this work is *Auḍaḥ al-Masalik fī sharḥ Alfīyat b. Mālik*. It is a commentary on the grammatical work *al-Alfīyah* by Ibn Mālik. The author of the commentary is Ibn Hishām, s. above No. 33. Brockelmann, I, 298, II, 25.

No. 36

X893.7 K844

Arabic.

Safinah Mustatībah by Muḥammad Qāṭah.

Size 9 x 7 and 7 x 5.

Folios 14. Written in naskhī. 19 lines to a page. White paper.

Undated, modern.

The beginning of a treatise on grammar by ash-Shaikh Muḥammad Qāṭah (or Qaṭah).

No. 37

X893.7 Sh1

Arabic—Turkish.

Tarjumān by Maḥmūd ash-Shihābī.

Size 4¼ x 3¼ and 3¼ x 2¼.

Folios 132. Written in roq'ah. 10 lines to a page. Richly decorated. Cream-colored paper. Red leather binding, embossed outside.

Date and name of author, f. 130 a: by Maḥmūd b. Khalīl ash-Shihābī, on Tuesday, Ṣafar 20 (September 18), 1859 (A. D. sic!).

An Arabic-Turkish abridged dictionary.

No. 38

X893.7 M29 W

Arabic.

Sharḥ as-Sullam by al-Mullawī.

Size $8\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ and $6 \times 3\frac{1}{2}$.

Folios 45. Written in naskhī. 23-25 lines to a page. Red titles.
Cream-colored paper.

Date, f. 45 b: Tuesday, The First Jumādā 11, 1167 A. H. (March 6, 1754 A. D.)

A commentary on the poetical treatise on logic, entitled as-Sullam al-Muraunaq fī-l-Mantiq by al-Akhḍarī, d. 941 A. H. (1534 A. D.) The author of this commentary is Aḥmad b. 'Abd at-Tattāḥ al-Mujīrī al-Mullawī, d. 1181 A. H. (1767 A. D.) Brockelmann, II, 355.

No. 39

X893.7 II7

Arabic.

'Ilm al-Badī'.

Size $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ and $6 \times 3\frac{1}{2}$.

Folios 15. Written in naskhī. 21 lines to a page. White paper.

Undated, modern.

The beginning of an anonymous treatise on rhetoric.

No. 40

X893.7 Ib65

Arabic.

Majmū'ah.

Size $7 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ and $5 \times 3\frac{1}{2}$.

Folios 89. Written in naskhī. 17 lines to a page. Red titles.

Cream-colored paper.

Undated.

Arrangement: 1) f. 1 a—49 b. The beginning of an unknown (cf. Brockelmann, II, 112) work entitled Kifāyat al-Mutakallim fī Adab al-'Ālim wa-l-Muta'allim by Burhān ad-Dīn b. Jamā'ah, d. 790 A. H. (1388 A. D.); 2) f. 50 b—89 b. The beginning of Risālah fī-l-'Amal li-l-Iṣṭarlāb, a treatise on astronomy, by Abū-s-Ṣalt Umayyah, d. 530 A. H. (1135 A. D.) Brockelmann, I, 487.

No. 41

X893.7 J18 T

Arabic.

Mawālīd ar-Rijāl by Abū Ma'shar.

Size $9 \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ and $6\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$.

Folios 93. Written in naskhī. 14 lines to a page. Illustrated with several tables. Yellowish paper.

Undated.

Kitāb Mawālīd ar-Rijāl wa-n-Nisā, a treatise on astrology, by Abū Ma'shar Ja'far b. Muḥammad al-Balkhī, d. 272 A. H. (885 A. D.) Brockelmann, I, 221.

No. 42

X893.7991 T87

Persian.

Akhlāq-i Nāṣirī by Naṣīr ad-Dīn Ṭūsī.

Size $8\frac{1}{2} \times 6$ and $5\frac{1}{2} \times 3\frac{1}{2}$.

Folios 136. Written in nasta'liq. 18 lines to a page. Red titles. Cream-colored paper. Green leather binding, outside embossed with gold.

Date and name of copyist, f. 133 a: 'Ajamī Mūmin Ṭālish; Muḥarram 8, 1077 A. H. (July 11, 1666 A. D.)

A treatise on ethics by the famous astronomer Naṣīr ad-Dīn Muḥammad b. Muḥammad at-Ṭūsī, d. 692 A. H. (1293 A. D.) Rieu, Brit. Mus. Pers. II, 441 b.

No. 43

X895.4 K84

Turkish.

Tarjumah-i Tanbīh al-Ghāfilīn.

Size $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ and 6×4 .

Folios 262. Written in naskhī. 13 lines to a page. Red titles. Cream-colored paper.

Undated.

An anonymous Turkish translation of Tanbīh al-Ghāfilīn, an Arabic treatise on theology, by Abū-l-Laith as-Samarqandī. Brockelmann, I, 196. Ḥājji Khalifah, II, 428.

No. 44

X895.4 Al7 Q

Turkish.

Dalā'il-i Nubuwwat by Altī Parmaq.

Size $11\frac{3}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$ and $9\frac{1}{2} \times 5$.

Folios 317. Several writings. 31 lines to a page. Red titles. Cream-colored paper. Black leather binding, embossed outside.

Undated.

The biography of Muḥammad the Prophet, entitled *Dalā'il-i Nubuwwat-i Muḥammadi wa Shamā'il-i Futuwwat-i Aḥmadi*, by Shaikh Muḥammad b. Muḥammad Altī Parmaq, d. 1033 A. H. (1624 A. D.) Rieu, Brit. Mus. Turk., 36 b.

No. 45

X895.4 K12

Turkish.

Yūsuf wa Zulaikhā by Ḥamdī.

Size $6 \times 3\frac{1}{2}$ and 4×2 .

Folios 212. Written in nasta'liq. 15 lines to a page in two columns. Red ruled margins, two 'unwāns, red titles. Cream-colored paper. The end is missing. Brown leather binding, outside embossed with gold.

Undated.

The well-known poetical love-story of Yūsuf (Joseph) and Zulaikhā, by Ḥamdī, d. 909 A. H. (1503 A. D.) Rieu, Brit. Mus. Turk., 169 a.

No. 46

X895.4 B473

Turkish.

Humāyūn Nāmah by Wāsi'. واسع

Size $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ and 6×3 .

Folios 390. Written in nasta'liq. 23 lines to a page. Gold ruled margins, 'unwān, red titles. Brown leather binding, outside embossed with gold.

Date and name of copyist, f. 388 b: Muḥammad Chalabī Kātib; Rajab 15, 967 A. H. (April 11, 1560 A. D.)

The Turkish translation of the famous Kalilah wa Dimnah, by 'Alī Chalabī Wāsi', d. 950 A. H. (1543 A. D.) Rieu, Brit. Mus. Turk., 227 a.

No. 47

X895.48 L142

Turkish.

Majmū'ah.

Folios 172.

A collection of private letters, documents, separate verses, small poems, etc.

چلی ؟

See

Inscriptions
in the Dargah
of 4. Nizamuddin
Auliya.
with margin
11/6/71

CURRENT REGULATIONS FOR BUILDING AND FURNISHING CHINESE IMPERIAL PALACES, 1727-1750

CARROLL B. MALONE
MIAMI UNIVERSITY

AN OLD manuscript on the above subject was bought in Peking in 1910 by Dr. Berthold Laufer and presented by him to the Library of Congress. There it is classified under *Orientalia*, Chinese, B. 182.25. It is bound in Chinese fashion in 40 small volumes, these being grouped into 4 *t'ao* (covers), ten volumes to each *t'ao*. The volumes average about 75 pages each.

The title written in Chinese on the cover of the first *t'ao* means "Fixed Regulations for making the large timbers of the Yüan Ming Yüan," the Yüan Ming Yüan being the country palace of the Manchu emperors near Peking. This title, evidently taken from the first page of the first volume, does not represent the contents of more than 10 volumes of the 40, namely, volumes 1-4 and 26-31. A title written in pencil on the outside of the first *t'ao*, possibly by Dr. Laufer's own hand, is the name given by him to the set and means simply "Regulations for the Yüan Ming Yüan." This comes a good deal nearer to fitting the actual contents. It is only after a study of each of the volumes in the set—for there is no preface, no table of contents, and no index—that I venture to call these 40 volumes by the title, "Current regulations for building and furnishing Chinese imperial palaces, 1727-1750." A study of the contents and nature of these volumes as given below will, I believe, show that this title is justified, for many other kinds of building supplies, large and small timber, stone, brick, tiles, paper, metals, and many kinds of work on all these materials by various craftsmen, skilled and unskilled laborers, are dealt with; and regulations not only for the Yüan Ming Yüan, but also for other palaces, as those at Jehol, Wan Shou Shan, and Hsiang Shan, and temples inside and outside of these palace grounds, as the Yung Ho Kung, the Lama Temple in Peking, are here recorded.

In some places the rules of "the government board" are quoted, without naming which board. It would seem likely that the Kung Pu, the Board of Works, is meant. But the building operations here provided for seem to be those which would come within the

scope of the Nei Wu Fu, the Imperial Household Department, and it is likely that this set of books was the current record of various regulations set down from time to time as occasion required without any attempt at codification.

Altogether 10 dates have been found in the 40 volumes. These are the dates of certain regulations, or of the settlement of certain accounts. The earliest date is that of the schedule of prices of the year 1725, the second year of Yung Cheng's reign, but this schedule is merely referred to by date and number, is not quoted here. The earliest schedule actually given is that of Yung Cheng 4, 1727. The latest date given is Ch'ien Lung 12, that is, 1747. But the Wan Shou Shan and the imperial garden there are referred to by names which they were not given officially until 1750 or 1751, when that garden was opened to celebrate the 60th birthday of the Emperor's mother. Hence we may take the years 1727 to 1750 as the period covered by this record. Some of the schedules given may be younger or older than these dates.

The manuscript in its present form shows the effects of age. The outer covers are made of thick pasteboard and covered with a rich satin brocade of a pattern of plum blossoms on a background of broken ice. These covers are badly worn and falling to pieces, only held together by red tape, such as is used in United States Government offices.

The paper of the manuscript is itself brown with age, especially so near the tops and bottoms of the pages where it was not protected by the covers. These original pages were smaller than the new whiter sheets which have been placed inside them to strengthen them, when the volumes were rebound long ago. The present *t'ao* were made to fit the rebound volumes, and their condition shows that the rebinding was no recent affair. Each volume is covered with good yellow paper and tied with silk. The number of the volume is written on the edge of the inside of the back cover of each volume in Chinese figures, probably at the time of rebinding.

The fact that volume 8, dealing with furniture-making, begins without heading or introduction, and does not seem to follow logically at the end of volume 7, suggests the possibility that these numbers may be at fault, and this may explain other illogical arrangements in the set. I myself found volumes 31-40 in the second *t'ao* and volumes 11-20 in the fourth *t'ao*. I placed them in their correct covers.

I think that there is no doubt that the manuscript is genuine. Neither externally nor internally does it bear any marks of a forgery, and at the price which Dr. Laufer paid for it in Peking, it would not be worth while for a clever forger to waste his time on a work of this sort.

The handwriting of the manuscript is delightfully clear. It seems to have been done by good scribes, not by a single hand but by several, probably at different times during the period named. A few evident errors occur, as on the first page the word "inch" for the word meaning 10 feet, which I have corrected in translation.

My own chief difficulty in reading it lay in its technical vocabulary, the language of stone masons, carpenters, wood-carvers, carters, temple decorators, layers of roof tiles and many other craftsmen. Some of the characters were written in an abbreviated form not found in Goodrich's, Williams's, nor Giles's Dictionaries. Some Chinese students helped me with some of these difficulties, but in some cases even they did not understand the technical language.

In the explanations of the contents which follow I have used quotation marks for direct translations, putting my own remarks in parentheses in such cases. The word translated "foot" is the Chinese foot, by treaty 14.1 English inches; but often some other length, even 9/10 of an inch shorter may be intended. Several foot rules are in use in Peking. The Chinese measure of weight is the catty, equal to $1\frac{1}{3}$ English pounds, and divided into 16 Chinese ounces, called taels. Prices quoted are in taels, marked T, and in decimals of the tael. The tael, being just the value of the silver, continually varies in relation to gold money, but we can say that it is often worth about U. S. \$.70.

A description of the contents of these "Regulations" volume by volume, and some extracts from them to illustrate the technical and detailed character of the work may be of interest.

Volume 1, p. 1, begins with the subject: "Yüan Ming Yüan Regulations for work on the large timbers." It is a list of timbers of various dimensions and the amount of carpenter work required to shape each one. To quote: "Eaves pillars; length from 12.5 ft. to 10.5 ft., diameter, 1 to 1.1 ft., each pillar one carpenter's time for $1\frac{1}{2}$ days. Length from 10.5 ft. to 8.5 ft., diameter, .9 ft., each pillar one carpenter's time for one day. Length from 10.5

ft. to 8.5 ft., diameter .8 ft. to .7 ft., each two pillars, one carpenter's time for $1\frac{1}{2}$ days."

Other dimensions follow these and different types of pillars with special names and dimensions for each type. Some are "golden pillars", "square pillars", "tower golden pillars", etc., some being 17 ft. tall. Lists of timbers and boards of many sizes and shapes for various parts of buildings, for bridges, for sluice-gates, for flag-poles, with directions for measuring them, and the amount of carpenters' time required for each, continue on through volumes 1, 2, and 3 and into volume 4. Not all of these are large timbers.

In volume four we hear about bamboo for fences, rattan for chairs, and the amounts of glue allowed for bookcases of various sizes. The wood-carvers appear on the scene, wood-turners, makers of inlaid furniture, and other furniture, with the amounts of yellow wax, polishing-grass, charcoal for melting the wax, and cloth, to be allowed for each foot of surface to be polished.

"For finishing southern cypress-wood, camphor-wood and inlaid furniture with water and hot wax, use for every square foot .075 oz. of polishing grass, .5 oz. of yellow wax, and for each catty of yellow wax use ten catties of charcoal, and for every fifty feet of surface use one foot of white cloth." Vol. 4, p. 24.

Volume 5 begins the regulations for stone work inside the Yüan Ming Yüan, including plain stone dressing and sculpture in several kinds of marble and stone. "*Han pai yü* (a white marble, dolomite) and *ch'ing pai yü* (a grayish marble) finished roughly 6 sq. ft., a stone cutter's time for one day; finished smoothly, 10 sq. ft., a stone cutters' time for 2 days." The time allowed for carving stone dragons, heads, scales, faces, body, teeth, claws, horns, and whiskers, roughly done, per sq. ft., a stone carver's time for $2\frac{1}{2}$ days; carefully done, $3\frac{1}{2}$ days. Dragon's head with hole bored for water-spout, each one, a stone-cutter's time for $3\frac{1}{2}$ days. Stone *ch'i lin* (mythological quadruped) and lions, fine work, 7 days per sq. ft. Vol. 5, pp. 12-14.

Regulations for brick masonry begin in volume 6, p. 37. Regulations for glazed tiles, used chiefly on roofs, begin on p. 10 of volume 7. Volumes 8 and 9 deal with furniture again. Volumes 11 to 15 regulate the painting on woodwork and pictures painted on the beams. We are told the amounts of oil and pigments for the various colors, and the areas to be painted by a painter in a day, for different kinds of painting. Papering walls and windows

and doors and mounting pictures are the subjects of volume 17. In a list of prices of miscellaneous articles in volume 18 we have an interesting price-list of different kinds of wood used at the palace.

Kind of wood	Weight in catties per cu. ft.	Price per catty	Price per cu. ft
<i>Tzu t'an</i> (best red wood).....	70	T .22	(T 15.40)
<i>Hua li</i> (a cheaper red wood)....	59	.18	(11.62)
<i>Nan mu</i> (<i>Machilus nanmu</i> , so-called 'cedar').....	28	.08	(1.84)
Elm (this and following woods except yellow poplar not bought by weight).....			.64
Camphor wood.....			.625
Locust64
Yellow poplar.....	56	.20	1.12
Southern cypress.....			1.20
Northern cypress.....			.64
<i>Tuan</i> (lime or poplar).....			.20
<i>Shan</i> (deal, pine or fir).....			.541

One surprising thing about the above list is that elm and locust, which are produced locally in the region of Peking, cost more than camphor-wood, which is transported from Formosa and perhaps elsewhere in the south.

After this list come the government board prices for wood, which are a little higher than those just quoted, and a price list for marble and stone, and the cost of transporting these, as though this were a part of the government board's regulations. (It is not always clear just where one list leaves off and another begins.)

An example of the technical language used is found in the prices quoted for marble and stone where the phrase *ts'ai yün*, 採運, meaning literally "pick transportation", which at first one would construe to mean, "transportation included", is found. The phrase is not given in the dictionaries, but I infer from an examination of the cost of the stone in comparison with the cost of transportation of stone that the prices quoted do not include transportation, as the example below will show. The phrase "one bridle", by which the animals per cart are counted, would seem to indicate one mule, except that the price paid, T 2.30 per "bridle" per day, is so large that it would seem that two animals pulling tandem

might be intended. It would require someone acquainted with the technical language of contractors or carters to explain these terms with certainty.

To quote some examples, volume 18, pp. 9-20: "Large pieces of *ch'ing pai shih* (gray marble), 10 to 25 cu. ft., at T 2.70 per 10 cu. ft. Pieces from 50 to 39 cu. ft., at T 4.50 per 10 cu. ft."

The rate runs up for larger pieces to 400-500 cu. ft. at T 14.00 per 10 cu. ft.

In the regulations for transportation the first item is "Large pieces of *ch'ing pai shih*, containing 27 cu. ft., to be loaded on one mule cart with one "bridle". For pieces containing more than 30 cu. ft. add a half mule "bridle" for each cart, making $1\frac{1}{2}$ mule "bridles, to go for 8 days. For more than 40 cu. ft. add one mule bridle for each cart, making two bridles, to go 8 days." For the larger pieces the number of animals and the number of days both increase, probably because the larger pieces had to move more slowly. The largest size given is for pieces containing 500 cu. ft. or more, 49 bridles to go for 31 days.

Thus calculating the cost of a piece containing 45 cu. ft., we find that it would cost at T 4.50 for 10 cu. ft., T 20.25. But the cost of transportation for 8 days, the minimum time given, for two "bridles", the correct number for pieces of this size, would amount to T 36.80. Hence we can be sure that the cost of the marble does not include the cost of the transportation, which is much larger.

In this same volume we are told of the measurement of gravel from the Hsiang Shan gravel pits and its transportation, rules for finishing beautifully marked stone with hot wax, varnish regulations for the Yang Hsin Tien (Nourish Heart Hall) and the rules for carving the dragons for the spirit shrine in the An Yu Kung, the ancestral hall in the Yüan Ming Yüan, dated 5th day of the 11th moon of the 7th year of Ch'ien Lung, 1742, "Regulations for the Yueh Lan (perhaps an ornamental fence) behind the Ch'ung Hua Lou (Hortensia Tower) in the Fang Hu Sheng Ching" in the Yüan Ming Yüan, and other rules for various kinds of metal work.

Volume 19 continues the metal work. On pages 3-4 we get the exchange rate for gold and silver. "Each oz. of gold changes for 13 oz. of silver." After discussing silver and iron, pewter and bamboo, the rules for making straw mats for use in building roofs and for awnings are given as of the 25th day of the 3d moon of

the 4th year, probably the fourth year of Ch'ien Lung, 1740, and these are followed by the new regulations for matting awnings of the 12th year of Ch'ien Lung, 1747.

Volume 20 mentions four dates, 1740, for the price list for paper, drawing silk, and other supplies for the T'ien Yü K'ung Ming (Heaven's vault, empty and bright, the name of a group of buildings) at the Fang Hu Sheng Ching; the price list of bamboo and paper for the fourth year of Yung Cheng, 1727; the increase of prices in the third year of Ch'ien Lung for bricks and tile, with the provision that the rule of the second year of Yung Cheng, 1724, should apply to items not covered in this new rule. But the rule of 1724 is not given. It seems a bit strange that the reduction of 30% in the price list for glazed tile and transportation, in the first year of Ch'ien Lung's reign, 1736, is not mentioned until Volume 34, while this later increase in prices, 1738, is mentioned in Volume 20. In this volume the prices and time required for hauling supplies to the North Gate at the Wan Shou Shan, though not called by that name at the time, and to the Fu Yuan Gate, a short distance east of the Great Gate of the Palace at the Yüan Ming Yüan, are given. These are followed by a number of price lists for miscellaneous articles and time for various building operations which extend through the rest of volume 20, and volumes 21, 22, and 23.

Volume 24 gives rules for making sacrificial vessels and ornaments for temple use. In both this and the next volume there are references to the new building-operations at the Hsiang Shan park, in the Emperor's garden, and at the Yung An Monastery. Volume 25 also records the rules for the foundry for casting the bronze pavilion at the Wan Shou Shan, giving the amounts of coal, charcoal, crucibles, earth and rope to be used in proportion to each 100 catties of bronze used. Similar rules for the foundry for incense burners at the Yung Ho Kung, the Lama temple in Peking, are listed.

The next five volumes, 26-31, are taken up with a graduated list of prices for wood of various sizes. Pine is taken as the basis for these calculations, which run from timbers 3 ft. in diameter and 60 ft. long (although it is not certain that there were any that large) to cost T 1334.94 apiece, down to posts 1½ ft. in diameter by 5 ft. long at T .13 each, and even to smaller stuff at T 1.20 per cart-load. At the end of volume 31 is found the schedule for additional prices by weight and volume to be added to the pine

prices for the more valuable woods. These prices are mostly the same as those given above, but with the addition of sandalwood at T 1.20 per cu. ft., and three other woods.

The earlier part of volume 32 is concerned with stone, marble, brick, and their transportation. But on p. 39 a brighter subject begins, the beautiful glazed tile which shines on the roofs of Chinese palaces. It is interesting to notice that the big conventionalized "fish" that curls its tail up on the topmost corners of the main roof-beam costs more than ten times as much in glazed tile as it does in the ordinary baked clay tile. This roof ornament in size No. 3, in the plain tile, is from 2.8 ft. to 2 ft. high, and costs T 80. In the glazed yellow or green tile, 9th style, it is 2.2 ft. high and costs T 8586. With each kind of glazed tile ornament goes a certain amount of lead, evidently to solder it into position. The larger tiles were so valuable that they must be transported carefully on men's shoulders by carrying-poles, and the smaller pieces had to be wrapped in straw and brought by cart. This we learn in volume 34. We find, too, that from Peking to the factory was a journey of 220 li or 4½ days. This I understand to mean the round trip. The porters were to be paid T .15 per day and each cart was to cost T 1.413.

Now the town from which the glazed tile is commonly reported to come is Liu Li Ch'ü, a town at the mouth of the Hun River Canyon, a little less than 50 li from Peking and about the same distance from the Yüan Ming Yüan. It is possible that in Ch'ien Lung's time the glazed tile came from some other place, or that the allowance for time and distance was very generous.

It is in volume 34 that we read of the reduction by 30% of the prices paid for glazed tile, for wrapping and transportation, and that the amount of lead was reduced by 2/10 for the large pieces and by 1/10 for the small ones. The subsequent increase of prices two years later has been mentioned in connection with the contents of volume 20.

The latter part of volume 34 and volume 35 contain various lists of prices for lime, wood, bamboo, hemp, metals, polishing materials, hardware of many varieties, painters' colors and other materials, and curtains. In volume 36 under the rules for brass-making we find recipes for giving the product the appearance of age. We have also pewter work and the wire screening put under the eaves to keep the birds out.

Volumes 37, 38, 39 and 40 contain regulations for making and ornamenting objects of temple furniture, prayer wheels at Yung Ho Kung, images, shrines, altars, a hall of the 500 Lohans in a building the shape of the character for "field" 田, perhaps the one in the Pi Yün Ssu ("Green Cloud Temple") or the one that was formerly at the Wan Shou Shan. There was a building of this shape in the Yüan Ming Yüan, but its shape was significant of the cultivated fields by which it was surrounded and there is no reason to think that it was used for a temple of the 500 Lohans.

The regulations governing the painting of palace and temple interiors which begin in volume 39 are continued in volume 40 with the regulations for the Pu Ning Ssu, a temple at Jehol, and concluded with the "Regulations approved by the Emperor for background of flowers, fruit, and forest-trees in the Ta Hsiung Pao Tien (Rich Hall of the Great Hero) behind the Hill of Imperial Longevity." This list gives the cost per square foot for painting various kinds of landscape. Surfaces representing ordinary foliage cost T 1.96 per square foot, including both colors and workmen's wages; while the best sorts of evergreen foliage cost T 2.2404 per square foot. This work is in oils, the work of artisans; for the best artists in China work only in water-colors.

Forty-four times, in all, the names of particular places or offices are mentioned. Nine of these I cannot identify. Of the 33 which I can identify, thirteen name the Yüan Ming Yüan, and seven others name places in, or adjacent to it. I should estimate also that well over half of the material of the 40 volumes is concerned with the regulations for the building and furnishing of the Yüan Ming Yüan. There are four references to the Wan Shou Shan and to places close to it. Similarly the Hsiang Shan counts three references and the Yung Ho Kung (the Lama temple in Peking) three. Jehol has two, to a palace and temple, and the Ching Shan (Coal Hill in Peking) one, this name being simply used to identify a certain kind of article, as certain other references simply identify price-lists or types of construction.

Scattered through the various price lists there are some articles which are designated as "Western ocean" hooks, or walls, or dials, and more than one reference to a "Western Ocean pagoda top (or dagoba top)". This is the term used for European, and the very scarcity of such articles shows that European influences were slight on the common affairs of everyday life. The list might have

been quite different later in the reign of Ch'ien Lung, when he had a whole set of European palaces built within his palace walls.

If the Yüan Ming Yüan were still standing intact, this manuscript in the hands of an expert contractor would furnish the basis for a fair approximation of the original cost of the buildings there. But now that the palace lies in ruins the estimate could not be at all accurate. The lists here do not give us the total cost of a single building, but only price lists for certain classes of material. We are given the cost of timbers of a certain size and the time a carpenter must spend to shape them, but we do not know how many timbers of each kind there were, nor even the carpenters' wages. We are told the price of many sizes and qualities of roof tiles, and many special shapes, but we do not know how many of each sort were used, nor even which buildings had glazed tile roofs.

The facts which are given here are of less value to one interested in the discovery of definite historical events than they might be to the student of architecture, or of interior decoration and furnishings, or to the economist who is looking for the prices of building-supplies, cart-hire and many of the staples of life in China two centuries ago.

ILOKO PATHOLOGY

MORICE VANOEVERBERGH

KABUGAW-APAYAW, MOUNTAIN PROVINCE, P. I.

IN A PREVIOUS PAPER, published in the JOURNAL 49. 1-21, we treated Iloko Anatomy.

In this paper we shall try to give the names of the different diseases, illnesses, bodily defects, etc., known to the Iloko.

We shall avoid as much as possible all words that are obviously Spanish, and we shall give only those that came to our personal notice.

Let it be said once for all that both the prefix *ag* and the suffix *en* (past form: infix *in*) form adjectival verbs meaning "to be affected with a certain illness, disease, etc."

akkánġ: Straddling, walking with the legs wide apart. Synonym: *sakkánġ*. See: *kiád*.

alimáseg: Very acute pain in the abdomen. As described by the Iloko: a feeling as if something were wound tightly around the place of the navel, at the inside. Cf. (*ag*)*bisáleg* and (*ag*)*síkal*. See: (*ag*)*síkal*.

alimbaság(en): To have sleeplessness, insomnia, abnormal wakefulness. See: (*ma*)*talimúdaw*.

(*ma*)*alis(án)*: To miscarry, to suffer miscarriage or abortion. From the stem *alís*, "expulsed human fetus", the passive prefix *ma* and the locative suffix *an*.

Other peculiarities relating to women: *lunay(én)*, *butiláw*, (*agpa*)*síkal*, (*ag*)*daraodó*, (*ka*)*dawi(án)*, *bakká*, (*agpamm*)*ukél*.

(*agalon*-)*álon*: To respire convulsively, to gasp. The intermittent respiration of a dying person. Synonym: (*agayon*-)*áyon*. Cf. (*ag*)*añġsáb*. See: *añġkít*.

alunit: A boil or furuncle, situated at the knee or, rarely, at the anus. Very painful. Cf. *lettég*. See: *lettég*.

(*ag*)*ámag*: To evacuate *ámag*, a kind of reddish, broad intestinal worm, about two inches long. Cf. (*agapat*-)*ápat* and (*ag*)*ariék*. See: (*agi*)*blénġ*.

ampo(én): To be pricked by *ampó*, a kind of small, blackish, fresh-water fish. The affected part swells up and the pain is very acute. See: *lettég*.

áno: Pus, matter, purulent substance. Synonym: *nána*.

añġin(en): To suffer a stroke, e. g., when the heart is affected, a stroke of apoplexy. Sometimes the body becomes livid. *Añġin* means: wind, draft, current of air. Synonym: (*na*)*báut ití añġin*. See: (*ma*)*talimúdaw*.

añġkít: Asthma.

Other peculiarities of respiration: (*ag*)*rúrek*, (*agalon*-)*álon*, (*ag*)-*an̄sáb*. See also: *gusiñg*.

(*ag*)*an̄glit*: To be afflicted with disease of the axilla or armpit. A peculiar odor is diffused by the affected part of the body. See: *gaddíl*.

(*ag*)*an̄sáb*: To pant, e. g., after running. Cf. (*agalon*-)*álon*. See: *an̄gkit*.

áok: A cutaneous disease of the scalp of children, consisting of one or more suppurating tumors. See: *gaddíl*, *lettég*, *pulták*.

(*agapat*-)*ápat*: To evacuate taeniae or tapeworms. Cf. (*ag*)*ámag* and (*ag*)*ariék*. See: (*agi*)*blén̄g*.

(*in*)*apáya*: Invaded by salt water. Said of rice fields. See: *aplát*.

aplát: A plant disease consisting of small masses of cottonlike threads adhering to the leaves, and inclosing a small animal, probably a kind of aphid or plant louse.

Other affections of plants: (*ag*)*koríteg*, (*ag*)*turiñg* *túriñg*, *b(in)**alit-un̄gég*, *batir(en)*, (*in*)*apáya*, (*na*)*n̄gorét*, (*man*)*áarak*.

áras: A disease of the mouth of children, and occasionally of adults, characterized by the appearance of pearl-colored flakes, a kind of aphthae, which make eating almost impossible. This disease, probably a kind of thrush, causes the death of many children. See: *gusiñg*.

(*ag*)*ariék* or (*ag*)*ariét*: To evacuate *ariét*, a kind of ascaris or round-worm. Cf. (*ag*)*ámag* and (*agapat*-)*ápat*. See: (*agi*)*blén̄g*.

ariñgkék: Short-necked. See: *buttiúg*.

arráp: Cf. *korárap*.

ayam(en): To have *ayám* or chicken ticks. See: (*ma*)*talimúdaw*.

(*agayon*-)*áyon*: Cf. (*agalon*-)*álon*.

ayyókes: Slightly stooping. Cf. *kubbó* and *tiñgíg*. See: *buttiúg*.

báed: Speaking nasally, through the nose, nasalizing. Cf. *bedé*. See: *mútal*.

bagás liñg-ét: Prickly heat, a cutaneous eruption of red pimples that have a small white point in the center; it is attended by intense itching. *Bagás liñg-ét* means literally "fruit (of) perspiration." Cf. (*agra*)*rasá* and *urísit*. See: *gaddíl*.

(*bina*)*bái*: Hermaphrodite, having womanlike traits (gait, etc.). Said of males. *Bái* means "female"; *babái* "woman"; the infix indicates resemblance. See: *buñgáw*, *kiád*.

bakká: Very large pudendum or vulva. In its first meaning a *bakká* is an earthen basin, used especially for washing rice, etc. See: (*ma*)*alis(án)*.

bakkawéñg: Curved, crooked, bent, twisted, deformed, distorted, bandy, e. g., a leg, a pod, a stick, etc. Cf. *sallákup*. See: *pílay*.

bakrán̄g(en): To feel pain in one's side. Cf. *ballaibi(en)* and *sikét(en)*.

(*ag*)*bakuár*: Cf. (*ag*)*saruá*.

*b(in)**alitun̄gég*: Worm-eaten. Said of camotes or sweet potatoes, in which a worm, called *balitun̄gég*, has taken its abode. See: *aplát*.

ballaibi(en): To have splenalgia, to feel pain of a neuralgic kind over the region of the spleen or milt. From the stem *ballaíbi*. Cf. *bakrán̄g(en)* and *sikét(en)*.

ballikúg: Perverting a person's words; relating the opposite of what somebody really said, while seeming to quote his words.

ballókat: Swollen. Said of the eyes, when the eyelids are swollen, e. g., through much weeping, the sting of a wasp, etc. Cf. *b(um)úsel*. See: *saguyepyp(én)*.

bañgkínŷ: Having one of a pair not matching its pendant, e. g., a person who is one-eyed (*buldínŷ*), cross-eyed (*pañgkís*), limping (*pílay* and *píl-ók*), who has only one leg, one arm, one hand (*pokól*), one ear (*pínŷud* or *rínŷud*), etc. Some time ago, a man who limped married a girl, who had had one of her breasts amputated: scoffers said they matched perfectly as both were *bañgkínŷ*. See: *bulsék*, (*ag*)*dúrek*, *pokól*.

(*agba*)*bará*: To have buboes, inflammatory swellings in the groin. This may happen, e. g., when one has an infectious wound in the foot. *Bará* means literally "lung." See: *lettég*.

barínŷrínŷ: (Walking) with the body inclined to one side or sidewise. See: *kiád*.

barkés: An inflammatory disease of the skin, often originating at the waist, and characterized by the presence of redness and itching and discharge of a watery exudation; probably a kind of herpes or eczema. See: *gaddíl*.

(*na*)*barték*: Drunk, intoxicated, inebriated, tipsy. See: (*ma*)*talimúdaw*.

(*agba*)*básil*: To have whitlow, felon, panaris or paronychia. *Básil* means literally "wedge." See: *pokól*.

basisáw(en): To experience a feeling as of water moving in the abdomen (while one walks). This happens to people who have drunk a large amount of water. *Basisaw* means "bladder." Cf. (*ag*)*bellad(án)*. See: (*ag*)*sikal*.

batír(en): A plant disease caused by a large, white worm or larva, called *bátir*, which gnaws at the roots. See: *aplát*.

(*ag*)*b(in)atlág*: Whose bruises or contusions dissolve, leaving a mark. Also: to be marked by mosquito bites (small swellings). The *t* of *agbi-natlág* is often superseded by a glottal catch in pronunciation, hence some authors write: *agbinaklág*. See: *lettég*, *súgat*.

(*na*)*báut ití añŷin*: Cf. *añŷin(en)*. Literally: struck by a current of air, a draft, the wind.

(*ag*)*bayanŷóboŷ*: To have cholera, cholerine. See: (*agi*)*blénŷ*.

beddál: Cf. *mútal*.

bedé: Stammerer, stutterer, hesitating, faltering. This is one of the few Iloko words, in which the *e* is not pronounced as usual; the first *e* is pronounced as in stammerer, the second like the German *ö*. Cf. *báed* and *mútal*. See: *mútal*.

(*na*)*begnát*: To suffer a relapse, the return of a disease after improvement.

bekkel(án): Goiter, bronchocele. *Bekkel* means "strangling"; the suffix is a locative. See: *lettég*, (*agpa*)*páraw*.

(*ag*)*bellad(án)*: To be oversated; a sense of weight or fullness in the stomach, a feeling experienced by persons who have eaten to excess, or who

are affected with dyspepsia, whether they suffer from it or not. *Bellád* means "swelling (of cooked rice, etc.)"; the suffix is a locative. Cf. *basisáw(en)*. See: *(ag)sikal*.

(agi)blén̄g: To have diarrhea, a morbidly frequent discharge of loose or fluid evacuations from the intestines. *Bellén̄g* means "throwing away"; *ibellén̄g* (without syncopation) "to throw away." *Agiblén̄g* also means "to evacuate the bowels"; the context must show whether the speaker means the disease or the simple action.

Other peculiarities of evacuations: *(ag)burís*, *(ag)bayañ̄góbonḡ*, *(na)lisay(án)*, *(ag)sika*, *tabbél*, *(ag)ámag*, *(agapat-)úpat*, *(ag)ariék*, *(sar)saripít(en)*. See also: *(ag)sikal*.

(na)blés: sprained. Said of any part of the body. From the stem *bellés*. Cf. *(na)bló* and *(na)piskel(án)*. See: *súgat*.

(agbe)besság: To be pale, pallid, wan. See: *(ma)talimúdaw*.

bettéd: Cramp, a spasmodic and painful involuntary contraction of the muscles. Sometimes pronounced: *bettég*. See: *(ma)talimúdaw*.

(agbi)bíneg: To be numb, benumbed, torpid, insensible. Cf. *(agpi)píkel*. See: *(ma)talimúdaw*.

(ma)birábid: To feel dizzy and feverish, after having eaten *birábid*, a kind of edible snail. The Iloko say that this happens to people who eat *birábid* out of season. See: *(ma)talimúdaw*.

bírit: Having a scar or scarlike indentation on the eyelid. See: *lettég*, *pañ̄gkís*, *súgat*.

(ag)bisáleg: To feel an acute pain in the abdomen, after having eaten what does not agree. Cf. *alimáseg* and *(ag)sikal*. See: *(ag)sikal*.

(ma)bisín: To be hungry, to feel hungry. See: *(ma)talimúdaw*.

bókol: Any projecting bone, e. g.: the malleoli, the wrist bones, the bridge of the nose, the two projections of the frontal bone on the forehead, etc.

(agbo)boksít: Cf. *(agbu)bussóg*. *Boksít* means "belly, abdomen."

(na)bló: Luxated, dislocated. Said of any part of the body. From the stem *dolló*. Cf. *(na)blés* and *(na)piskel(án)*. See: *súgat*.

boskáu: Cataract of the eye. See: *bulsék*.

botto(án): Callosity, callus. *Bottó* means either "pivot", or "position of the child ready to be born." The suffix is a locative. Cf. *kapúyo*. See: *lettég*.

b(in)ukbúk: Worm-eaten; with one or more cavities or decayed spots; affected with necrosis, with caries. Said of wood, grain, teeth, etc. *Bukbúk* means "wood worm, grain beetle", etc. See: *toppól*.

(agpamm)ukél: To grow breasts. Said of girls, whose breasts are beginning to appear. *Bukél* means "seed, sphere, ball, roundness", etc. The prefix *agpañ̄g* means "to cause, to order." The final *ñ̄g* of the prefix has been combined with the initial *b* of the stem into *m*, which is reduplicated here. See: *(ma)alís(án)*.

(bul)bulán(en): To be moonstruck, lunatic. *Búlan* means "moon." Cf. *(agu)úyoñ̄g*. See: *(agu)úyoñ̄g*.

buldínŷ: One-eyed, single-eyed, blind in one eye, having but one eye. Cf. *banŷkínŷ*. See: *bulsék*.

bulsék: Blind, eyeless.

Other defects of the eyesight: *buldínŷ*, *banŷkínŷ*, *boskáu*, *burág*, *korárap*. See also: *panŷkís*.

búnŷa ti matá: A sore or ulcer on the eyelid. Literally: fruit of the eye. See: (*ag*)*kamatá*, *lettég*.

buŷáu: Having one or both testicles swollen.

Other peculiarities relating to males: *lúnŷas*, *púnŷat*, *kultóp*, (*bina*)*bái*.

(*na*)*burábur*: Become ill through the influence of a *burábur*, or caudal spine of the sting ray. This is how it is supposed to happen: a malevolent person catches a sting ray, cuts off its caudal spine, and then releases it alive; if he sticks the *burábur* in a tree, the latter dies; if he sticks it in the ground, in a spot on which a person trod or urinated, the latter will become ill. See: (*nakab*)*kablaáu(an)*.

burág: Having a disease of the eye, which appears as a discoloration of the iris; the latter becomes white and the eyesight is very much impaired. Synonym: *surág*. See: *bulsék*.

(*ag*)*burís*: To have diarrhea or flux, a flowing or fluid discharge from the bowels, a purging or looseness of the bowels. Cf. *tabbél*. See: (*agi*)*blénŷ*.

burtónŷ: Smallpox, variola; pock-marked. Cf. *kamóras* and *tokó*. See: *gaddíl*.

ɔ(um)ásel: To be inflamed; an inflammation of the eyes, manifesting itself by redness and swelling, and occasioned, e. g., by much weeping. *Búsel* means "flower bud"; the infix means "to grow, to become." Cf. *ballókot*. See: *saguyepyep(én)*.

busigit: Hemorrhoid, piles. See: *lettég*.

(*agbu*)*bussóg*: Having a pot-belly, a protuberant belly. Said of children. *Bussóg* means "satiety." Synonym: (*agbo*)*boksít*. Cf. *buttiúg*. See: *buttiúg*.

(*ag*)*búteg*: To snivel. With carabaos, it is a sign of the *rogárog* disease. Cf. *letlet(én)* and *panaténŷ*. See: *panaténŷ*.

bútig: A kind of wart, an excrescence or protuberance on the face, resembling an ordinary wart, but smaller, softer and less black. Cf. (*tokak*)*tókak*. See: *lettég*.

butíláu: Protrusion of the uterus into the vagina. See: (*ma*)*alís(án)*.

buttiúg: Having a pot-belly, a protuberant belly. Said of adults, especially males. Cf. (*agbu*)*bussóg*.

Other peculiarities of stature: (*agbu*)*bussóg*, (*gayonŷ*)*gayónŷ*, (*kas la tiwan*)*tiwan*, *kawág*, *pandék*, *doríri*, (*ag*)*luk-ób*, *kubbó*, *ayyókos*, *arínŷkék*, *tiŷíg*, *kippít*, (*ag*)*kawíl*.

dáig: Cf. *sárut*.

daldál: Speaking with difficulty. As described by the Iloko: speaking like a man, who is chewing betel nut. See: *mútal*.

(*agpa*)*dára*: To expectorate blood (hemoptysis); to vomit blood (hematemesis.) *Dára* means "blood"; the prefix *agpa* means "to cause, to order."

Other hemorrhages: (*ag*)*darinǵónǵo*, (*ag*)*sika*, (*ag*)*daraodó*, (*ka*)-*dawi(án)*. See also: *súgat*.

(*ag*)*daraodó*: To suffer a morbidly copious discharge of the menses; e. g., after having lifted up a heavy object, after having been beaten, etc. Cf. (*ka*)*dawi(án)*. See: (*ma*)*alis(án)*, (*agpa*)*dára*.

(*ag*)*darinǵónǵo*: To bleed at the nose (epistaxis or nosebleed). See: (*agpa*)*dára*, *panaténǵ*.

(*ka*)*dawi(án)*: Menses, menstruation, menstrual discharge. *Kadawián* also means "habit, custom." Synonym: (*sanǵa*)*ili*. Cf. (*ag*)*daraodó*. See: (*ma*)*alis(án)*, (*agpa*)*dára*.

dolinǵ: Cf. *gilab*.

(*ag*)*donǵér*: To shake the head with a slight, rapid, continuous movement, from side to side, as old women do. Cf. (*agtaǵ*)*tanǵ-éd*. See: (*ag*)*lammín*.

doríri: Having a protuberant breech, projecting buttocks. See: *buttiúy*.

dúgul: With one or more wens or sebaceous cysts. Said of the scalp or any part of the body, but more especially of the bridge of the nose, which, in this case, looks like having been smashed and flattened out, so as to form ugly protuberances on both sides. See: *lettég*, *panaténǵ*.

(*na*)*dúnor*: Injured, hurt; bruised, contused. Any lesion, bruise, fracture or the like; any bodily injury causing severe pain. When the injury is external, *nadúnor* is sometimes used in opposition to *nasúgat*, wounded. See: *súgat*.

(*ag*)*duǵsá*: To fall asleep, to drowse, to doze. Before going to bed. Cf. *saguyepyep(én)*. See: *saguyepyep(én)*.

(*ag*)*dúrek*: To run. Said of the ear, when discharging pus or other matter. *Dúrek* means "cerumen or earwax."

Other affections of the ear: (*nakab*)*kablaáw(an)*, *ritinǵ*, *risay*, *kopilénǵ*, *pinǵud*, *baǵkinǵ*, *túlenǵ*.

(*um*)*bál*: To swell, to tumefy; when the swelling extends over a comparatively large area and shows no sign of external injury or core. More especially to have dropsy, beriberi. From the stem *ebbál*. Cf. *l(um)tég*. See: *lettég*. *gaddíl*: Itch, scabies, mange; scab. Cf. *gudgúd*.

Other skin diseases: *gudgúd*, *urisit*, *bagás linǵ-ét*, (*agra*)*rasá*, (*supot*)*súpot*, *úok*, *ǵarkés*, *kúrad*, *kúrad ti bólo*, *labait*, *mómo*, *samríd(en)*, *burtónǵ*, *tokó*, *kamóras*, *kútel*, (*ag*)*katinǵ*, (*ag*)*tarindanúm*, *kamánaw*, (*ag*)*aǵlít*, *lasí*. See also: *lettég*.

(*na*)*gámud*: Poisoned; after having eaten or drunk food or drink poisoned by man, not naturally poisonous. Cf. *sabídonǵ*.

garadgád: Scratch; a slight, superficial wound. Synonym: *garomiád*. Cf. (*na*)*karamút(an)*. See: *súgat*.

(*ag*)*garadugúd*: To gurgle. A gurgling sound produced in the bowels. See: (*ag*)*síkal*.

garomiád: Cf. *garadgád*.

(*gayonŋ*)*gayónŋ*: Whose fat or flesh shakes or vibrates (when in motion). Said of obese, excessively corpulent, very fat or fleshy persons. See: *buttiúg*.

gidgíd: Cf. *mágíd*.

gílab: Having a cast in the eye, a slight squint. Synonym: *dolínŋ*. Cf. *pañŋkís*. See: *pañŋkís*.

gitáb: Whose teeth clatter. When suffering from fever, etc. Cf. (*ag*)*ngaretñgét*. See: (*ag*)*lammin*, *toppól*.

gítiv: Having a wound or scar, at or near the mouth. See: *gusínŋ*, *súgat*.

gudgúd: An exanthema or eruption on the skin, characterized by very small vesicles, that have the same color throughout, and contain no pus; the affected surface is more or less wet and itches greatly. *Gudgúd* is sometimes, although improperly, called *gaddíl*, "itch." See: *gaddíl*.

gurígur: Fever. Synonym: *púdot*. Cf. (*ag*)*payegpég*.

gusínŋ: Harelipped. The same term is applied to earthenware notched at the rim.

Other affections of the mouth: *soriáb*, *tammí*, *piwak*, *piwis*, (*ag*)*liñgús*, (*maka*)*ronŋít*, *gítiv*, (*ag*)*lupták*, *mómo*, (*ag*)*manŋ-mánŋ*, *áras*, (*agka*)*kátay*, (*kabul*)*kabúl*, *úmel*. See also: *toppól*, (*agpa*)*páraw*, *añgkit*, *mútal*.

(*na*)*iddal(án)*: Whose throat (pharynx or gullet) is obstructed by a sharp object; e. g., when a fishbone, a spine, etc. sticks in one's throat. Cf. (*na*)*ispal(án)* and (*na*)*ltot(án)*. See: (*agpa*)*páraw*.

(*sañŋa*)*íli*: Cf. (*ka*)*dawi(án)*. From *íli*, town, and the prefix *sañŋa* of units. *Sañŋaíli* also means "stranger, guest."

(*na*)*ispal(án)*: Whose throat (pharynx or gullet) is obstructed by food, experiencing difficulty in getting the food down the throat. In such a case, one has to drink to get it down. Cf. (*na*)*iddal(án)* and (*na*)*ltot(án)*. See: (*agpa*)*páraw*.

kábaw: Doting, dotard, whose mind is impaired by age, in second childhood. *Kábaw*, in its form *nakábaw*, also means "light", and is said of wine, tobacco, etc. See: (*agu*)*úyonŋ*.

kabbí: Cf. *pañŋál*.

(*ag*)*kabitég*: To be marked or streaked with one or more wales or stripes. Cf. *l(imm)ítem*. See: *lettég*, *súgat*.

(*nakab*)*kablaáw(an)*: A disease characterized by general debility, softening of the ears and clammy perspiration. Literally: having been greeted. The sick person is supposed to have been caressed by the ghost of a dead relative. Cf. (*na*)*lugán(an)*. See: (*ag*)*dúrek*, (*ma*)*talimúdaw*.

Other diseases related to superstitions: (*na*)*lugán(an)*, (*na*)*padsínŋ(an)*, (*maka*)*regrég*, (*nai*)*kiriñŋ*, (*na*)*burábur*.

(*kabul*)*kabúl*: Masticating with difficulty, unable to chew or masticate, e. g., a toothless person. See: *toppól*, *gusínŋ*.

(*ag*)*kalatokót*: To shake, to tremble. Said of the knees. A sign of

debility. *Agkalatokót ti túmeñña*: he is very weak, very feeble; literally: his knees shake, tremble. See: *(ag)lammin*, *pílay*, *(ma)talimúdaw*.

kamánaw: Patches of discolored skin. They are much paler than the rest of the Iloko's skin and tend to spread. See: *gaddíl*.

(ag)kamatá: To have a kind of ophthalmia, characterized by redness of the eyeballs and discharge of abundant gum. From *matá* "eye." Cf. *mágid*.

Other diseases of the eyes: *mágid*, *(ag)múkat*, *búnña*, *ti matá*. See also: *pañgkís*.

kambál: With a double yolk. Said of eggs.

kammóor: Bump; a protuberance or swelling resulting from a bump or blow. See: *lettég*, *súgat*.

kamóras: Measles, rubeola. Cf. *burtónñ* and *tokó*. See: *gaddíl*.

kamóro: Pustule, pimple. Synonym: *taramidoññ*. See: *lettég*.

(agka)kapsút: To feel weak, feeble, debilitated, exhausted. Synonym: *(agka)kápuy*. See: *(ma)talimúdaw*.

(agka)kápuy: Cf. *(agka)kapsút*.

kapúyo: Blister, whether caused by a burn or other injury. Synonym: *lapúyok*. Cf. *botto(án)*. See: *lettég*.

karabukob(én): To have a sore throat, e. g., after having been shouting for some time. Cf. *(agpa)páraw*. See: *(agpa)páraw*.

(na)karaís(an): Cf. *(na)karamút(an)*.

(na)karamút(an): Scratched, by nails or claws. Synonym: *(na)karaís(an)*. Cf. *garadgád*. See: *súgat*.

(ag)karominas: To be affected with the sickness, mortal in some cases, resulting from the eating of *karominas*, a kind of medusa or jellyfish. One experiences a very disagreeable and strong itching sensation in the throat, much stronger than that which occasionally results from the eating of taro rhizomes. See: *(agpa)páraw*.

(agka)kátay: To have the mouth filled with saliva; in the case of children or idiots: to drivel, to dribble, to drool, to sliver, to slabber, to slobber. See: *gusiññ*, *(agu)úyoññ*.

(ag)katiññ: To have leprosy, lepra; to be leprous, a leper. Namely: the itching variety. Cf. *kútel*. See: *gaddíl*.

kawág: A very tall man, much taller than the generality of his companions. Synonym: *kawákaw*. Cf. *pandék*. See: *buttiúg*.

kawákaw: Cf. *kawág*.

(ag)kawíl: To cross the legs, either the thighs, when sitting in a chair. etc., or the shanks, when sitting on the ground. with the knees upturned or in tailor's fashion. See: *buttiúg*.

kawíññ: Knock-kneed, inkneed; whose great toe is separated from the others and points more or less sidewise; whose thumb points sidewise more than usual, whatsoever its position. Synonym: *kiwíññ*. See: *pílay*, *pokól*.

kelkel(én): To cough, to have repeated fits of coughing. A symptom of influenza, a cold, bronchitis, etc., not: of tuberculosis. Cf. *(ag)uyék*. See: *(agpa)páraw*.

(*lettég a pa*)*kléb*: An abscess or a boil, which discharges its pus inside, and consequently may occasion blood poisoning. Literally: overturned abscess or boil. *Pakléb*, from the stem *kelléb*, "cover", and the prefix *pa*, "to cause, to order", means "with mouth or aperture downward." Cf. *lettég*. See: *lettég*.

kiád: Walking with abdomen protruding. Said also of women in the last stages of pregnancy. Cf. *saraṅḡkinud* and *taloṅḡkiád*.

Other peculiarities of gait: *taloṅḡkiád*, *saraṅḡkinud*, *akkáṅḡ*, (*ag*)-*taraddék*, *bariṅḡgríṅḡ*, *pillakús*, (*bina*)*bái*. See also: *pílay*.

kílat: With one or both lower eyelids stretched downward. See: *paṅḡkís*.

kílit: One of whose eyes appears smaller than the other, being usually half-closed by the eyelids, e. g. through the presence of an epicanthus. Cf. *kosipét*, *kúyep* and *liskabéṅḡ*. See: *paṅḡkís*.

kimat(én): To be struck by lightning.

kipít: Flattened sidewise. Said of the head. See: *buttiúg*.

(*agkiray*)*kiráy*: To be blink-eyed; to wink, to blink, to nictate, to nictitate habitually or repeatedly; to scintillate, to sparkle, to twinkle. Said of persons, of fire, stars, etc. *Agkiráy* means "to wink," a single action. Cf. (*ag*)*kuridemém*. See: *saguyepyep(én)*.

(*nai*)*kiríṅḡ*: To have a kind of shaking palsy. *Kiríṅḡ* is the name of a period of days, approximately from the twentieth to the twenty-fifth of October, and of the atmospheric disturbances, which usually occur at that time; popular imagination has associated with the *kiríṅḡ* all kinds of beliefs and superstitions. *Naikiríṅḡ* means literally "influenced by the *kiríṅḡ*." See: (*nakab*)*kablaáw(an)* and (*ag*)*lammin*.

kisáp: Snub-nosed; completely shorn; bare. In the first meaning, said of a person, who has a nose, which is smaller and flatter than usual, especially with reference to the bridge; in the second meaning, said of a person, whose hair has been cut very near to the scalp, all over the head; in the third meaning, said of a plot of ground, a field, etc., which has been cleared completely of grass, herbs, etc. See: *panaténḡ*, *pulták*.

(*ag*)*kissíw*: To have epilepsy, falling sickness. See: (*ma*)*talímúdaw*.

kiwíṅḡ: Cf. *kawíṅḡ*.

kodiáp: A scar or blotch, rough, discolored and almost white. Cf. *píglát*. See: *lettég*, *súgat*.

kopiléṅḡ: Flattened and distorted. Said of the ear. See: (*ag*)*dúrek*.

(*na*)*koplát(an)*: Abraded or abraded. Said of the skin; when a person is wounded by abrasion or superficial excoriation. Synonym: (*na*)*lupsít(an)*. Cf. *súgat*, *latlát*, and (*na*)*kulatlát(an)*. See: *súgat*.

korárap: With defective eyesight; myope, myopic, shortsighted, near-sighted; farsighted, hypermetrope, hypermetropic, presbyope, presbyopic. Synonyms: *arráp*, *matán manók*. See: *bulsék*.

(*ag*)*korarét*: To be affected with convulsion, cramp, tetanus; to shrink from cold. Cf. (*agku*)*kurót*. See: (*ag*)*lammin*, (*ma*)*talímúdaw*.

korítrep: With upturned eyeballs. This defect prevents the affected person from looking down. See: *paṅḡkís*.

(ag)koríteg: To shrivel. Said of leaves; this is due to plant disease. See: *aplát*.

kosipét: One or both eyes appearing smaller than usual, e. g. when one or both eyes are provided with an epicanthus, or prolongation of a fold of the skin of the upper eyelid over the inner angle or both angles of the eye, common in Mongolians. Cf. *kílit*, *kúyep*, *liskabénġ* and *pinġkit*. See: *pañġkis*.

kubbó: With crooked, curved back; bending down, stooping (especially while walking); humpbacked, hunchbacked. Cf. *ayyókos*. See: *buttiúg*.

(na)kulatlát(an): Skinned, flayed, excoriated, peeled. Cf. *latlát* and (na)koplát(an). See: *súgat*.

kultóp: With very small penis. See: *bunġáw*.

kúrad: A contagious affection of the skin, characterized by the appearance of discolored whitish patches, covered with vesicles or powdery scales, and at times itching greatly; a kind of tetter or ringworm. It occasionally spreads over the whole body, except the sole of the foot and the palm of the hand, giving the affected individual a dirty appearance and a characteristic smell. See: *gaddíl*.

kúrad ti bólo: The *labait* skin disease, when affecting the hands. Literally: *kúrad* of bamboo. Cf. *labait*. See: *gaddíl*.

(ag)kuridemém: To wink at irregular intervals, to blink (when scarcely awake), to glimmer, to wink, to flicker. Said of drowsy persons, of lamps, fire, etc. Cf. (agkiray)kiráy. See: *saguyepyep(én)*.

(agku)kurót: To stand all shrunk up. Said of sick fowls. Synonyms: (ag)kuyayót, (agku)kuyót. Cf. (ag)korarét.

kútel: Leprosy, lepra; leper. This variety causes no itching. Cf. (ag)-katiñġ. See: *gaddíl*.

(ag)kuyayót: Cf. (agku)kurót.

(ag)kuyegyég: Cf. (ag)pigergér.

kúyep: With eyes half-shut, blinking. Synonym: *súyep*. Cf. *kílit*, *kosipét* and *liskabénġ*. See: *pañġkis*.

(agku)kuyót: Cf. (agku)kurót.

labait: An inflammatory disease of the skin, affecting the cheeks, and characterized by discoloration and very strong itching, a kind of herpes or tetter; it generally begins with a small round patch, which spreads when scratched, and it disappears only after some four years, leaving a permanent mark. Cf. *kúrad ti bólo*. See: *gaddíl*.

(na)lamáw: Scalded, burnt (with hot liquid or steam). Cf. (na)siniít. See: *súgat*.

(aglam)lamigo: To be affected with a chronic disease, consisting in a kind of cold-bloodedness. Such persons are exceedingly sensitive to cold; they feel cold when there is a little draft, the smallest breeze, when they are slightly startled, etc. See: (ag)lammin.

(lam)lamiís(en): Cf. (ag)lammin.

(ag)lammin: To feel cold, to be chilled, to shiver with cold, to have a chill (caused by exposure to cold or wet), to tremble, to shake from cold. Synonym: (lam)lamiís(en).

Other similar affections: (*aglam*)*lamígo*, (*ag*)*koraré*t, (*na*)*pad*síñg-(*an*), (*ag*)*pigergér*, (*nai*)*kiriñg*, (*ag*)*payegpég*, (*ag*)*kalatokót*, *gitáb*, (*ag*)*don*gér, (*agtañg*)*tañg-éd*, (*agsid*)*siddáaw*, *s(um)gár*. See also: (*ma*)*talimúdaw*.

lapúyok: Cf. *kapúyo*.

lasí: Dandruff. See: *gaddíl*, *pulták*.

latlát: Gall, chafe, fray, a sore or wound in the skin from rubbing. The *latlát* appears only on the back of horses and on the buttocks of persons. Cf. (*na*)*koplát(an)* and (*na*)*kulatlát(an)*. See: *súgat*.

letlet(én): Whose nose is obstructed, having catarrh of the nose. The affected person experiences difficulty in breathing. Cf. (*ag*)*búteg* and *panatén*g. See: *panatén*g.

lettég: Boil, furuncle; abscess. Cf. *alunít* and (*lettég a pa*)*kléb*.

Other excrescences and tumors: (*lettég a pa*)*kléb*, *alunít*, *kamóro*, *bún*ga *ti matú*, *áok*, *busigít*, (*agba*)*bará*, *kapúyo*, *l(um)tég*, (*um*)-*bál*, *pañgál*, *ampo(én)*, *bekkel(án)*, *dúgul*, *kammóor*, (*ag*)*kabitég*, *botto(án)*, *bútig*, (*tokak*)*tókak*, *ritíñg*, *sídíñg*, (*ag*)*b(in)atlag*, *piglát*, *bírit*, *kodiáp*. See also: *gaddíl*, *l(um)tég*.

l(um)tég: To swell, to tumefy; to become infected (tainted with morbid matter). From the stem *lettég*. Cf. (*um*)*bál*.

Other infections: (*maka*)*súsup*, (*agpak*)*pakílo*. See also: *lettég*.

(*ag*)*liñgús*: To make a wry face, a grimace, at the same time slightly shaking the head, e. g., when hearing something unpleasant. See: *gusiñg*.

(*na*)*lisay(án)*: To have a kind of indigestion or dyspepsia. Its most striking symptoms are pain in the abdomen, immediately after meals, diarrhea and evacuation of almost undigested food. See: (*agi*)*blén*g.

*liskabén*g: With eyes almost completely shut. The eyelids of such persons are abnormally large, and their eyelashes almost invisible. Cf. *kílit*, *kosipét* and *kúyep*. See: *pañgkís*.

l(imm)ítem: Become livid, either by sickness or by contusion or whipping. Cf. (*ag*)*kabitég*. See: *súgat*.

(*na*)*lodók(an)*: Pricked, the instrument not remaining in the wound. Cf. (*na*)*puris(an)*. See: *súgat*.

(*na*)*ltot(án)*: To choke, having swallowed the wrong way. From the stem *lottót*. Cf. (*na*)*iddal(án)* and (*na*)*ispal(án)*. See: (*agpa*)*páraw*.

(*aglú*)*lua*: To be watery, tearful, weeping, shedding tears. Said of the eyes. *Luá* means "tear." See: *saguyepyep(én)*.

(*na*)*lugán(an)*: Indwelt; obsessed, possessed. A further development of the sickness described under (*nakab*)*kablaáw(an)*, which appears when the person in question starts talking; the ghost is supposed to have entered the patient's body. Said also of persons believed to be favored with the indwelling of a saint, or to be possessed by an evil spirit. From the stem *lúgan*, "vehicle", the passive prefix *na* and the locative suffix *an*. Cf. (*nakab*)*kablaáw(an)*. See: (*nakab*)*kablaáw(an)*.

lugpi: Cripple, lame, unable to walk straight, paralytic, palsied, paralyzed in the knees. Such persons can walk only in a squatting position. Cf. *lupisák* and *sapíloy*. See: *pílay*.

(*ag*)*lugsót*: To have the rectum protruding. This happens occasionally to children having dysentery.

(*ag*)*luk-ób*: To lean one's head on one's hands, with one's elbows resting on the ground, while sitting or kneeling on the ground; to lean one's head on one's arm or arms, or to bow down with one's head touching the ground, while kneeling on the ground; to lean one's head on one's arm, face downward, while lying on one's side. To lean one's head on one's hands, while in an ordinary sitting or kneeling position, is called (*ag*)*dúmog*. To lean one's head on one of one's hands is called (*agpan*)*ímid* (from *tímid*, "chin", and the prefix *agpan*, *ñy* and *t* being combined into *n*). To lie face downward is called (*agpa*)*kléb* (from *kelléb*, "cover"; cf. (*lettég a pa*)*kléb*). See: *buttiúg*.

lunay(én): To have hysterodinia or pain in the uterus, after childbirth, occasioned by the failure of the blood to flow out; after the latter has been evacuated, the pain ceases. See: (*ag*)*síkal*, (*ma*)*alis(án)*.

lún̄gas: With glans partially uncovered. Said of the penis in a state of erection. Cf. *pún̄gat*. See: *buñgaw*.

(*na*)*luñ̄gsót*: Cf. (*na*)*luñ̄gtót*.

(*na*)*luñ̄gtót*: Rotten, decayed, putrefied, corrupted, decomposed, tainted, spoiled, putrid. Synonym: (*na*)*luñ̄gsót*. Cf. (*ag*)*ránót*.

lupisák: Cripple, lame, unable to stand or to walk, unable to lie down straight, paralytic, palsied, paralyzed in the legs. *Lupisák* also means "sitting on the ground." To squat or sit down upon the hams is called (*ag*)*masñgáad*. Cf. *lupí*. See: *pílay*.

(*na*)*lupsít(an)*: Cf. (*na*)*koplát(an)*.

(*ag*)*lupták*: To chap, to fissure, to crack. Said of the lips, the tongue, etc. Cf. (*ag*)*rañ̄giád*. See: *gusín̄g*, *súgat*.

mágid: An inflammatory disease of the eyes, characterized by redness of the eyeball and gummy secretion of sebaceous matter all along the margins of the eyelids, a kind of bleareye or lippitudo; as a result the eyelashes generally fall out. Synonym: *gidgid*. Cf. (*ag*)*kamatá* and (*ag*)*múkat*. See: (*ag*)*kamatá*.

(*ag*)*mañ̄gmán̄g*: To have inflammation of the commissures of the lips. See: *gusín̄g*.

matán manók: Cf. *korárap*. Literally: chicken's eye. *Matá* means "eye"; the *n* is a ligature. This appellation is very appropriate, as the sight of the Iloko *korárap* is dimmed more especially toward evening.

(*agma*)*mayó*: To experience a great debility or weakness of the whole body, without apparent reason; it usually ends in death. See: (*ma*)*talimúdaw*.

melmél: Unable to speak, because the mouth is filled with food. See: *mútal*.

mómo: A children's disease consisting in a kind of itch or scabies completely surrounding the mouth. See: *gaddíl*, *gusín̄g*.

(*ag*)*múkat*: To discharge gum. Said of the eyes. Cf. *mágid*. See: (*ag*)*kamatá*.

mútal: Enunciating indistinctly or imperfectly, pronouncing defectively.

Said of persons who do not pronounce distinctly one or more consonants, e. g., the *r*, the *d*, etc. Synonym: *beddál*. Cf. *bedé*.

Other peculiarities of speech: *bedé*, *búed*, *daldál*, *melmél*, (*ag*)*ñgádal*, *úmel*. See also: *gusíng*.

nána: Cf. *áno*.

(*ag*)*ñgádal*: To experience difficulty in pronouncing, in articulating, to talk inarticulately, to speak indistinctly, to pronounce incompletely. Said of dying persons. See: *mútal*.

(*ag*)*ñgaretné*: To gnash repeatedly. Said of teeth, when a person repeatedly grinds the teeth. The single action is called (*ag*)*ñgariét*. Cf. *gitáb*. See: *toppól*.

ñgírñgír: Dirty, soiled, smeared, greasy. Said of the body, clothes, etc.

(*na*)*ñgorét*: Very fibrous, containing little meat or juice, almost entirely made up of fibers. Said of camotes, yam beans or *siñgkamás*, sugar cane, etc. See: *aplát*.

ónǵib: Whose teeth become black and decay piecemeal. Said only of permanent teeth. Cf. *ribríb*. See: *toppól*.

onǵñgób: Noseless, whose nose becomes black and gradually decays. See: *panaténǵ*.

(*na*)*padsíng(an)*: To be affected with a disease characterized by pallor and cold or chilliness. This is supposed to be the result of meeting a ghost on the way. See: (*nakab*)*kablaáw(an)*, (*ma*)*talimúdaw*, (*ag*)*lammín*.

(*agpak*)*pakilo*: To be infected, to suppurate and spread, affecting the neighboring tissues. Said of wounds. See: *l(um)tég*.

panaténǵ: Cold, catarrh, rheum. Cf. (*ag*)*búteg* and *letlet(én)*.

Other affections of the nose: (*ag*)*búteg*, *letlet(én)*, (*ag*)*dariñgónǵo*, *onǵñgób*, *dúgul*, *phwis*, *kisáp*, (*na*)*pantók*, *pappáp*.

pandék: Short, low in stature, dwarfish, pygmean, below the common stature; dwarf, pygmy. Cf. *kawág*. See: *buttiág*.

(*na*)*pantók*: Long. Said of the nose. Cf. *pappáp*. See: *panaténǵ*.

pañgál: Parotitis, mumps. Synonym: *kabbi*. See: *lettég*.

pañgkís: Cross-eyed, squint-eyed, squinting. strabismic, affected with strabismus. Cf. *bañgkínǵ* and *gílab*.

Other deformities of the eyes: *gílab*, *kílit*, *kosipét*, *kúyep*, *liskabénǵ*, *piñgkit*, *korírep*, *kílat*, *bírit*. See also: *bulsék*, (*ag*)*kamatá*, *saguyepyep(én)*.

pañgók: Pestilence, plague. Any contagious or infectious epidemic disease of animals that is virulent and devastating, e. g.: rinderpest or cattle plague, glanders or équinia, swine plague, hog cholera, chicken cholera or fowl cholera, etc.

pappáp: Short, flat. Said of the nose. Cf. (*na*)*pantók*. See: *panaténǵ*.

(*agpa*)*páraw*: To be hoarse. Cf. *karabukob(én)*.

Other affections of the throat: *karabukob(én)*, *kelkel(én)*, (*ag*)*uyék*, (*ag*)*rárek*, (*ag*)*karomínas*, (*na*)*iddal(án)*, (*na*)*ispal(án)*, (*na*)*l-tot(án)*, (*ag*)*saiddék*, *til-i(én)*, *bekkel(án)*. See also: *gusíng*.

(*na*)*parpár*: Smashed, crushed, shattered, shivered, splintered. Said of the head, the limbs, the fingers, etc., bones, bamboos, etc. See: *súgat*.

páwad: Fingerless. Said of the hand. Cf. *tugkél*. See: *pokól*.

(*ag*)*payegpég*: To have a chill (forming the precursor of fever), to shiver with fever; to tremble, to shake from fever; to have chills and fever, fever and ague, ague, an attack or paroxysm of malaria. Rarely used for trembling with fear, etc. Cf. *gurigur*. See: (*ag*)*lammin*.

(*ag*)*pigergér*: To tremble, to shake, to shiver, to shudder, to quake. Caused by old age, cold, fever, fear, etc. Synonyms: (*ag*)*kuyeggyég*, (*man*)*ayegtég*. See: (*ag*)*lammin*.

piplát: Cicatrix, scar, naevus, blemish, birthmark. Cf. *kodiáp*. See: *lettég*, *súgat*.

piplús: Cripple, lame, paralytic, one of whose legs is paralyzed; palsied, paralyzed in one leg; walking with one leg trailing behind. See: *pílay*.

pigsúl: Hobbling slightly, walking with a slight hitch or hop, halting slightly, limping a little. Cf. *pílay* and *pil-ók*. See: *pílay*.

(*agpi*)*píkel*: To tingle, to be prickling, prickly. The sensation sometimes produced in a benumbed limb. Cf. (*agbi*)*bíneg*. See: (*ma*)*talimúdaw*.

pílay: Limping, halting, walking lamely, hobbling, walking with a hitch or hop. Cf. *bañgkinǵ*, *pigsúl* and *pil-ók*.

Other affections of the legs or feet: *pil-ók*, *pigsúl*, *piplús*, *lupisák*, *lugpi*, *sapíloy*, *pulíkat*, *bakkawénǵ*, *sallákup*, *píwis*, (*ag*)*kalatokót*, *tugkél*, *kawinǵ*, *tallinǵa(en)*. See also: *kiád*, *pokól*.

pillakús: Weak-kneed, tottering, walking with unsteady steps, stumbling, walking clumsily. See: *kiád*.

pil-ók: Limping, halting, walking lamely, hobbling, walking with a hitch or hop, one leg being shorter than the other. Cf. *bañgkinǵ*, *pigsúl* and *pílay*. See: *pílay*.

piñgkit: Small; with one or both eyes smaller than usual. Cf. *kosipét*. See: *pañgkis*.

piñgud: One-eared, having but one ear. Synonym: *riñgud*. Cf. *bañgkinǵ*. See: (*ag*)*dúrek*.

(*na*)*piskel(án)*: Sprained. Said of a *piskél*, any large muscle of the arm or of the leg. Cf. (*na*)*blés* and (*na*)*bló*. See: *súgat*.

piwak: Large. Said of the mouth. See: *gustinǵ*.

píwis: Wry, twisted, distorted, crooked, contorted, awry, turned to one side, bent, deformed, curved, bandy. Said of the mouth, the nose, the legs, etc. See: *gustinǵ*, *panaténǵ*, *pílay*.

pokól: One-handed, having but one hand. Cf. *bañgkinǵ*.

Other affections of the arms or hands: *bañgkinǵ*, *páwad*, *reppénǵ*, *sinǵkól*, *solpáy*, *ripinǵ*, *kawinǵ*, *ritinǵ*, (*agba*)*básil*, *saliwagkinǵ*. See also: *pílay*.

púdot: Cf. *gurigur*. *Púdot* also means "heat."

pulíkat: Stiff, rigid (at irregular intervals). Said of one or both legs. See: *pílay*.

pulták: Bald. Cf. *puñgges*.

Other peculiarities of the scalp: *puñggés*, *úban*, *sapáw*, *áo*k, *lasí*, *kisáp*.

pún̄gat: With glans completely uncovered. Said of the penis, e. g., of circumcised persons. Cf. *lún̄gas*. See: *bun̄gáw*.

puñggés: Having little hair. Said more especially of girls and women. Cf. *pulták*. See: *pulták*.

(*na*)*puris(an)*: Pricked, the thorn, splinter, etc., remaining in the wound. Cf. (*na*)*lodók(an)*. See: *súgat*.

(*na*)*putól(an)*: Beheaded, decapitated; décolleté, low-necked. Said of persons and dresses. See: *súgat*.

(*ag*)*ran̄giád*: To chap, to crack, to fissure. Said of the sole of the foot. Cf. (*ag*)*lupták*. See: *súgat*.

(*ag*)*rárek*: To have rhonchus, rãle, rattle; to have death rattle. Cf. *tíl-i(én)*. See: (*agpa*)*púraw*, *an̄gkit*.

(*agra*)*rasá*: To be affected with a cutaneous eruption, very similar to prickly heat or *bagás lún̄g-ét*, but caused by sitting on a carabao. *Rasá* is the name of a kind of crab. See: *gaddíl*.

(*maka*)*regrég*: To be affected with a disease characterized by fever and a kind of stupor. The person in question is supposed to have lost his soul, i. e., his life-giving, animating principle. *Regrég* means "dropping"; the prefix *maka* indicates completion of the action. See: (*naka*)*kablaáw(an)*, (*ma*)*talimúdaw*.

reppén̄g: With paralyzed, lame fingers. See: *pokól*.

ribrib: Whose teeth become black and decay piecemeal. Said only of deciduous, temporary or milk teeth. Cf. *ón̄gib*. See: *toppól*.

rin̄gud: Cf. *pin̄gud*.

ripin̄g: Double, accrete, grown together, accreting. Said of fruits, two fingers, two bodies, etc. See: *pokól*.

risay: Torn. Said of the ear. See: (*ag*)*dúrek*.

ritin̄g: Excrescence, abnormal or unnatural growth. This appears chiefly at or near the ears, or as an additional thumb; it is not to be confounded with a wart, a wen, etc. See: (*ag*)*dúrek*, *lettég*, *pokól*.

(*ag*)*rogárog*: To be affected with a contagious or infectious disease, which manifests itself by much sniveling. This is a disease exclusively of carabaos. The same term is applied to the continual cry of hogs that are moving around. Cf. (*ag*)*búteg*.

(*maka*)*ron̄giit*: To laugh. Whether a loud or a suppressed laugh, whether showing the teeth or not. Synonym: (*maka*)*ron̄gsiit*. See: *gusiñg*.

(*maka*)*ron̄gsiit*: Cf. (*maka*)*ron̄giit*.

(*ag*)*rún̄ot*: To rot, to decay, to waste away, to wear out, to be spent gradually. (*Na*)*lun̄gtót* or (*na*)*lun̄gsót* means "rotten, putrefied, tainted" (e. g., fruits, leaves, meat, fish, etc.). (*Na*)*rukóp* means "rotten, snapped easily, torn easily" (e. g., wood, timber, thread, cloth, etc.). (*Na*)*rún̄ot* means "decayed, worn out, spent" (e. g., teeth, limbs, clothes, candles, etc.). See: *toppól*.

(*ru*)*rusók(en)*: To eructate acridly, fetidly. Whether a symptom of dyspepsia or not. To eructate is called (*ag*)*tig-áb*. See: (*ma*)*talimúdaw*.

sabídonġ: Poison. Any kind of poison: food or drink, naturally poisonous or artificially poisoned, and poison introduced into the body by wounds. Venom of snakes, etc., or artificial poison on arrows, etc., is called *gíta*. Cf. *(na)gámud*.

saguyepyep(én): To be very sleepy, drowsy, heavy with sleepiness, which is characterized by frequent yawning and the involuntary closing of the eyes. Synonym: *yepyep(én)*. Cf. *(ag)duñġsá*.

Other affections of the eyes: *(ag)duñġsá*, *(agkiray)kiráy*, *(ag)kuri-demdém*, *(aglú)lua*, *b(um)úsel*, *ballókot*. See also: *pañġkís*.

(ag)saiddek: To hiccup. Cf. *til-i(én)*. See: *(agpa)páraw*.

sakit: Sickness, illness, ailment, disease, malady; pain, ache. See: *(ma)talimúdaw*.

(ag)sakit: To be sick, ill, indisposed, unwell, ailing.

(ma)sakit: To be sick, etc. (cf. *(ag)sakit*); sick person, patient.

(na)sakit: Sore, painful, aching, to ache, to hurt; sickness, etc. (cf. *sakit*). Cf. *(na)ut-út*.

sakkánġ: Cf. *akkánġ*.

salicagkínġ: Unquiet, never still, disturbing. *Saliwagkínġ ti punagim-imana* means literally: his using his hands is *salicagkínġ*. Said of persons who are touching and fingering whatever they see, searching and overturning the contents of trunks and drawers, jostling everybody, etc. See: *pokól*.

sallákup: Bandy-legged. Cf. *bakkawénġ*. See: *pílay*.

sallapidinġ: Cf. *sidinġ*.

samríd(en): To be affected with rash, resulting from the touch of a *samríd*, a small black hairy caterpillar; to die from eating *samríd*. In the first meaning, said of persons; in the second, of animals. See: *gaddíl*.

sapáw: With scattered gray hairs, pepper-and-salt. Cf. *úban*. See: *pulták*.

sapíloy: Cripple, lame, unable to walk, paralytic, palsied, paralyzed in the legs. *Lugpi* is a cripple by birth. *sapíloy* is not. See: *pílay*.

(ag)sarúaw: To be affected with a morbid craving for food. Such persons feel a longing for food several times a day, although they are not really hungry. Occasionally used with the simple meaning of feeling hungry. See: *(ma)talimúdaw*.

saranġkínud: Walking with knees slightly curved and abdomen slightly protruding at every step. In *saranġkínud* there is a slight jerking forward movement of knees and abdomen; in *kiád* and *talonġkiád* the gait is steady. See: *kiád*.

(sar)saripít(en): To suffer from irregular or intermittent discharge of urine, to urinate intermittently, a few drops at a time. See: *(agi)blénġ*.

(ag)sarúá: To vomit, to spew. Synonym: *(ag)bakuár*. See: *(ma)talimúdaw*.

sárut: Phthisis, consumption, pulmonary phthisis, pulmonary consumption, tuberculosis. Synonym: *daíg*.

(ma)sdó: To experience a kind of faintness. e. g., after having drunk cold water when in a state of perspiration. From the stem *seddó*. See: *(ma)talimúdaw*.

s(um)gár: To stand on end. Said of the hair. From the stem *seggár*.
See: (*ag*)*lammín*.

(*agsid*)*siddáaw*: To be affected with a disease which makes one startle at every turn without apparent reason. *Siddáaw* means "wonder." See: (*ag*)*lammín*.

sidiñg: Mole, beauty spot. Synonym: *sallapídiñg*. See: *lettég*.

(*ag*)*sika*: To have dysentery. See: (*agi*)*blénj*, (*agpa*)*dára*.

(*ag*)*sikal*: To feel pain in the abdomen, e. g., when a discharge from the intestines must take place. Cf. *alimáseg* and (*ag*)*bisáleg*.

Other affections of the abdomen: (*ag*)*bisáleg*, *alimáseg*, *lunay(én)*, (*ag*)*bellad(án)*, *basisáw(en)*, (*ag*)*garadugúd*. See also: (*agi*)*blénj*, (*ma*)*talimúdaw*.

(*agpa*)*sikal*: To suffer the pangs of childbirth, to labor, to be in labor, to travail. The prefix *agpa* means "to cause, to order." See: (*ma*)*alís(án)*.

sikét(en): To feel pain in one's waist. Cf. *bakráñg(en)* and *ballaibi(én)*.

(*agsi*)*sikkil*: To be in a state of complete stiffness, to experience a general stiffness all over the body, e. g., after having taken a bath in a state of perspiration. See: (*ma*)*talimúdaw*.

(*na*)*sinít*: Scorched, burnt (with fire or hot solids). Sometimes used colloquially for: tipsy, fuddled. Cf. (*na*)*lamúw*. See: *súgat*.

siñgkól: Lame, paralytic, palsied, paralyzed in one or both hands. The palm of the hand of the *siñgkól* is turned outward. Cf. *solpáy*. See: *pokól*.

solpáy: Lame, paralytic, palsied, paralyzed in one or both hands. The hand of the *solpáy* is simply inert, without being twisted. Cf. *siñgkól*. See: *pokól*.

soriáb: With deformed upper lip. The upper lip of the *soriáb* bulges out at its upper part, almost reaching the nose, without however changing the general trend and position of its border. See: *gusiñg*.

súgat: Wound, whether stab, cut or rent. Cf. (*na*)*koplát(an)*.

Other lesions: (*na*)*dánor*, (*na*)*kulatlát(an)*, *latlát*, (*na*)*koplát(an)*, *garadgúd*, (*na*)*karamút(an)*, (*na*)*lodók(an)*. (*na*)*ubad(án)*, (*na*)*puris(an)*, (*ag*)*rañgiád*, (*ag*)*lupták*, *gitiw*, *birit*, (*ag*)*b(in)atlág*, *piglát*, *kodiáp*, (*ag*)*kabitég*, *l(imm)íttem*, *kammóor*, (*na*)*sinít*, (*na*)*lamúw*, (*na*)*blés*, (*na*)*bló*, (*na*)*piskel(án)*, (*na*)*putól(an)*, (*na*)*parpár*. See also: (*agpa*)*dára*.

(*supot*)*súpot*: Nettle rash, urticaria, uredo or hives. An eruption or efflorescence on the body consisting of round spots, slightly raised and itching greatly. In general appearance, these spots resemble those occasioned by the bites of fleas and mosquitoes. *Súpot* means "pouch"; the reduplication indicates resemblance. See: *gaddíl*.

surág: Cf. *burág*.

(*maka*)*súsup*: To become infected, to suppurate. Said of wounds. *Súsup* means "sucking"; the prefix indicates active possibility or completion of the action. See: *l(um)tég*.

súyep: Cf. *kúyep*. In several other Philippine dialects, *súyep* means "sleeping."

tabbél: Hard evacuation from the intestines. Cf. (*ag*)*buris*. See: (*agi*)*blén̄g*.

(*ma*)*talimúdaw*: To feel dizzy, giddy, vertiginous; to be affected with vertigo, swimming of the head; to be fainting, swooning. Cf. (*agulaw*)-*úlaw*.

Other sensations: (*agulaw*)-*úlaw*, (*ma*)*sdó*, *tarobaáy(en)*, (*ma*)*bisín*, (*ag*)*saráaw*, (*ag*)*kalatokót*, (*agka*)*kapsút*, (*ma*)*birábid*, (*agma*)-*mayó*, (*ma*)*tíltíl*, (*nakab*)*kablaáw(an)*, (*agbe*)*besság*, *añín(en)*, (*na*)*padsín̄g(an)*, (*agsi*)*sikkíl*, *tíl-i(én)*, (*ag*)*kissíw*, (*ag*)*koraré*, (*maka*)*regrég*, (*agbi*)*bíneg*, (*agpi*)*píkel*, *bettég*, *tortób*, (*na*)*barték*, (*ag*)*saruá*, (*ru*)*rusók(en)*, *sakít*, (*na*)*ut-út*, *ayam(én)*, *alimbáság(en)*. See also: (*ag*)*lammin*, (*ag*)*síkal*.

tallín̄gá(en): To decay. Said of the nail of a toe, which starts decaying at one of its corners, through constant contact with earth. See: *pílay*.

taloñgkiád: Walking with curved body, its central part protruding forward. The *kiád* walk with only the abdomen protruding, the *taloñgkiád* with the whole body protruding, from legs to chest. Cf. *kiád* and *sarañgkinud*. See: *kiád*.

tammí: With protruding underlip. See: *gusiñ̄g*.

(*agtañ̄g*)*tañ̄g-éd*: To move the head up and down with a slight, rapid, continuous movement, as old men do. *Agtañ̄g-éd* means "to nod"; the reduplication of the stem marks the progressive form "to be nodding." Cf. (*ag*)*don̄gér*. See: (*ag*)*lammin*.

(*ag*)*taraddék*: To trip, to move with light quick steps. See: *kiád*.

(*man*)*árak*: To stop flowering. Said of the *sabun̄gánay*, the unopened flower cluster of the banana. From the stem *tárak* and the prefix *man̄g*, the final *ñ̄g* of the prefix being combined with the initial *t* of the stem into *n*. *Taráken* means "to remove a litter of swine." See: *aplát*.

taramídon̄g: Cf. *kamóro*.

(*ag*)*tarindanum*: To have a kind of affection of the skin resembling blistering; it affects hands and feet and is caused by prolonged soaking. Derived from *danum* "water." See: *gaddíl*.

tarobaáy(en): To experience a feeling of weakness or debility, which happens in the morning, when one failed to eat the previous evening. See: (*ma*)*talimúdaw*.

(*man*)*ayegté*: Cf. (*ag*)*pigergér*. From the stem *tayegté* and the prefix *man̄g*, the final *ñ̄g* of the prefix being combined with the initial *t* of the stem into *n*.

tíl-i(én): To have convulsions, spasms. Said of dying children, whose respiration is intermingled with frequent hiccups. Cf. (*ag*)*rárek* and (*ag*)*saiddek*. See: (*agpa*)*páraw*, (*ma*)*talimúdaw*.

(*ma*)*tíltíl*: To feel weak, feeble. Which is a result of excessive handling by parents, owners, etc. while young. Said of persons and animals. See: (*ma*)*talimúdaw*.

tiñ̄gtg: Leaning sidewise, inclined sideways. Said of the head. Cf. *ayyókos*. See: *buttiág*.

(*kas la tiwan*)*tiwan*: Tall and lean. Said of persons. Literally: like a swordfish. See: *buttiüg*.

(*tokak*)*tókak*: Wart. Cf. *bütig*. See: *lettég*.

tokó: Chicken pox, varicella. Cf. *burtónǵ* and *kamóras*. See: *gaddil*.

toppól: Having lost one or more teeth.

Other affections of the teeth: (*kabul*)*kabúl*, (*ag*)*rúnot*, *ribríb*, *ónǵib*, *b(in)ukbúk*, (*agwali*)*wáli*, *gitáb*, (*ag*)*ngaretǵét*. See also: *gusiǵ*.

tortób: A kind of spasm, resembling the angina pectoris or spasm of the chest. As described by the Iloko: a very painful disease consisting in a sense of suffocating contraction or tightening of the lower part of the chest, which subsequently moves from place to place, chest, head, shoulders, waist, legs, etc. See: (*ma*)*talimúdaw*.

tugkél: Without toes. Said of the foot. *Tugkél* means literally "planting or fixing in place some long and narrow object," e. g. a candle, a pole, etc. Cf. *páwad*. See: *pílay*.

túleǵ: Deaf. See: (*ag*)*dúrek*.

(*agturing*)*túring*: To put forth leaves smaller than usual, below the normal size. A plant disease. *Turingtúring* is also the name of a small, almost round, much flattened fish. See: *aplát*.

(*na*)*ubad(án)*: Chafed, fretted. See: *súgat*.

úban: Gray, hoary; gray-haired, gray-headed. Cf. *sapúw*. See: *pulták*.

(*agulaw*-)*úlauw*: To feel dizzy, giddy, vertiginous, faint, inclined to swoon; to be affected with vertigo, swimming of the head. Cf. (*ma*)-*talimúdaw*. See: (*ma*)*talimúdaw*.

úmel: Dumb, mute. See: *gusiǵ*, *mútal*.

urísit: A cutaneous eruption of red pimples, resembling those of prickly heat or *bagás linǵ-ét*, but larger, and occasionally spreading over the whole body. See: *gaddil*.

(*na*)*ut-út*: Sore, aching. Cf. (*na*)*sakít*. See: (*ma*)*talimúdaw*.

(*ag*)*uyék*: To cough. A general term, sometimes used specifically for the cough of consumptives. Cf. *kelkel(én)*. See: (*agpa*)*páraw*.

(*agu*)*úyonǵ* or (*agma*)*úyonǵ*: To be insane, mad, crazy, demented, mentally deranged, of unsound mind, lunatic, moonstruck, idiotic, feeble-minded, imbecile; to be affected with dementia, insanity, folly, madness, mental alienation, mental derangement, lunacy, idiocy, imbecility, feeble-mindedness. Cf. (*bul*)*bulán(en)*.

Other mental diseases: (*bul*)*bulán(en)*, *kábaw*, (*agka*)*kátay*.

(*agwali*)*wáli*: To be loose. Said of teeth. See: *toppól*.

yepyep(én): Cf. *saguyepyep(én)*. Probably not genuine Iloko.

WHENCE CAME THE SUMERIANS?

GEORGE A. BARTON

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

If the Elamites or their close kindred were the first to settle in the alluvial region, which later became Babylonia, as now seems probable from the testimony of the pottery, they were not long in undisputed possession of the field, for they were at the dawn of history displaced or submerged by a people whom we call the Sumerians,¹ though we do not know what they called themselves. The Sumerians were in Babylonia before the dawn of history—how long before, Mr. Woolley's discoveries at Ur are just revealing—and contributed most to its civilization. They were a highly cultured agricultural people, when they entered the country.² Whence they came, we do not know. It was formerly thought that they came from the East and were somehow akin to the Elamites,³ but it is now clear that they represented a civilization distinct from and independent of that of Elam. They spoke an agglutinative language⁴ quite distinct from that of Elam;⁵ they made a type of pottery quite different from that found at Susa,⁶ and they were

¹ Sumer, the name by which southern Babylonia was called after about 2400 B. C., appears to be a corruption of the name Girsu, the Sumerian name of one of the quarters of Lagash. In the earliest inscriptions the name is frequently written SU-GIR or SUN-GIR: this might easily be corrupted into Sumir or Sumer. For presentations of this theory see H. Radau, *Early Babylonian History*, p. 58, n. 6; Rogers, *History of Babylonia and Assyria*, I, 356, and Barton, *Semitic Origins*, 192, n. 1.

² See C. L. Woolley, *The Sumerians*, Oxford, 1929, chs. I and II. There is much in ch. I concerning the ethnology, however, from which one must dissent.

³ See, e. g., the late W. H. Ward in the *American Journal of Archaeology*, New Ser. Vol. IX, 1905, pp. 77 ff.

⁴ For details see S. Langdon, *Sumerian Grammar*, Paris, 1911; F. Delitzsch, *Sumerische Grammatik*, Leipzig, 1914; and O. Poebel, *Grundzüge der sumerischen Grammatik*. Rostock, 1923.

⁵ See, e. g., the specimens of the language published by Scheil in de Morgan's *Délégation en Perse*, vols. III, V, VI, and XIV.

⁶ Cf. de Morgan's *Délégation en Perse*, vol. XIII, with the pottery pictured in de Sarzec's *Découvertes en Chaldée*. Specimens of both kinds are pictured in Frankfort's *Study of Pottery in the Ancient Near East*, I.

the authors of a pictographic system of writing that was clearly not of Elamite origin.⁷ A few years ago one was inclined to seek their origin in the north, and to hope that further study of the Caucasian languages might bring to light some dialect akin to the Sumerian tongue, but that hope seems at present to be vain. The work of those who have tried to prove it is not convincing.⁸ There is much to be said for the theory that the Sumerians entered Babylonia from the south, approaching it via the Persian Gulf, and that they came from a warm country. In the first place, they are found in control of cities in southern Babylonia. While specimens of their art have been found as far north as the city of Ashur,⁹ Sumerian control during the historical period did not extend north of Kutha. If they ever had control of Kish and Opis, they lost it just at the dawn of history to the Akkadians. Agade and Babylon were distinctly Semitic cities. Other indications of a southern origin are that their dress consisted, as numerous statues and reliefs show, of a skirt, which left the body nude from the waist up¹⁰—a type of dress which hardly originated in a cold climate. Further, on solemn religious occasions, when Sumerians were officiating before the gods, they discarded all clothing, and were entirely nude.¹¹

If they came from the south, the question, whence they migrated, is a most interesting one. Some have attempted recently to find the original home of the Sumerians in the valley of the Indus. As long ago as 1912 three inscribed seals of an unusual character

⁷ Cf. the Elamite writing of the earliest time in *Délégation en Perse*, vol. VI, with the Sumerian as set forth in Barton's *Origin and Development of Babylonian Writing*, Leipzig, 1913.

⁸ For attempts to establish a connection see M. Tseretheli's articles, "Sumerian and Georgian" in *JRAS*, 1914, 1-36; 1915, 255-288, and 1916, 1-58; also C. Autran, "Suffixes pluriels asiatiques et caucasiens", in *Babyloniaca* VIII, 1924, 59 ff., and F. Bork, "Das Sumerisch eine kaukasische Sprache" in *OLZ*. XXVII, 1924, 169 f.

⁹ Cf. W. Andrae, *Die archaischen Ischtar-Tempel in Assur*, Leipzig, 1922, p. 56, also Sidney Smith, *Early History of Assyria to the Year 1000*, London, 1928, ch. VI.

¹⁰ See, e. g., the picture of Ur-Nina and his family on the plaque pictured in de Sarzec's *Découvertes en Chaldée*, pl. 2bis; the various statues of Gudea pictured in the same work, and the statue of Lugaldau du in Banks' *Bismya*, p. 191.

¹¹ A good example of this is afforded by the plaque from Nippur published in Hilprecht's *Old Babylonian Inscriptions*, Pl. XVI, and often reproduced elsewhere.

were found at Harappa on the Ravi in the Panjab.¹² Since 1924 the Archaeological survey of India has excavated both at Harappa and at Mohenjo-daro, in Sind on the Indus, in strata far below those which yield Buddhistic antiquities, sites in which they have found hundreds of inscribed objects.¹³ A few of the signs in these inscriptions (twenty-five out of one hundred and eighteen signs) resemble Sumerian characters so closely that, if all the signs were harmonious with these, we should have no hesitation in pronouncing the writing Sumerian. These inscriptions were found in connection with brick buildings and pavements which closely resemble the brick-work of the Sumerians in Babylonia of the period of the third dynasty of Ur, 2400-2300 B. C. These facts taken together have led some enthusiastic students¹⁴ to connect the beginnings of civilization in India with the Sumerians. As ninety-three of the characters in the inscriptions which the present writer has seen do not resemble Sumerian characters at all, some of them resembling Hittite hieroglyphs more, and some of them characters in early Chinese writing, while one or two resemble Egyptian hieroglyphs, the inscriptions cannot be Sumerian.¹⁵ They represent an independent evolution of picture-writing,

¹² They were published by Arthur Venis in *JRAS*, 1912, pp. 699-703.

¹³ See Sir John Marshall's article, "First Light from a long Forgotten Civilization: New Discoveries of an Unknown Pre-historic Part of India" in the *Illustrated London News*, Sept. 20, 1924, p. 528; also the issue for Jan. 7, 1928, p. 10; and *The Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report*, 1922-23, pp. 102-104; 1923-24, pp. 47-54 and pl. XIX; 1924-25, pp. 60-80 and pls. XXII and XXVIII.

¹⁴ Professor A. H. Sayce first called attention to the Sumerian resemblances in an article in *The Illustrated London News* of Sept. 27, 1924, p. 566. He was followed by C. J. Gadd and Sidney Smith in the same journal for Oct. 4, 1924, pp. 614, 615. The hint thus given was taken up by L. A. Waddell in his book *The Indo-Sumerian Seals Deciphered*, London, 1925—a book thoroughly unsound in method. Vaidyanatha Ayyar, an Indian scholar, building on Waddell's work, published in 1927, at Madras, a book entitled *The Sumerian Origin of the Laws of Manu*—the trend of which is sufficiently indicated by its title. The last two works certainly are based on unreality.

¹⁵ The writer has carefully compared the signs in these Indian seals with Chinese, Elamite, Sumerian, Egyptian, Hittite, Cretan, and Cypriote characters, and has no hesitation in saying that it is independent of them all. His conclusions have been published in Vol. VIII of the *Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*. Influence from the Indus on early Sumerian art has been suggested to Sidney Smith (*Early History of*

as independent of all other systems as the Chinese, Elamite, Sumerian, Egyptian, Hittite, and Cretan systems are independent of one another. The Indian origin of the Sumerians cannot be predicated on the basis of these discoveries. Possibly there was an interchange of commerce between Sumer and the Indus, which led to the adoption of a few Sumerian characters, but it is not necessary to suppose even that; for the resemblance of a few characters in the two systems may be accidental, just as the resemblance between some of these Indian characters and Chinese and Hittite must be accidental.

If we cannot connect the Harappa and Mohenjo-daro seals with the Sumerians, we have no evidence connecting the Sumerians with India. Of course they may have originated in some Indian center further away than the Indus, though that is not probable. Others have thought of some point on the shores of Persia, accessible by water to southern Babylonia; the only difficulty with this theory is that we know of no center in that region where traces of such a civilization have been found. As plausible a theory would be that they originated in Oman in eastern Arabia, and that the curious people in the mountains of Oman, who, according to Harrison,¹⁶ still adore the rising sun with religious exercises in an unknown tongue, may be their descendants. It is possible that such a people might have descended from survivors of palaeolithic man, who, during the floods at the end of the glacial epoch, survived in the mountains of Oman. Until we have more evidence, this theory, however ill supported, is as good as any other.

However, before committing ourselves to any theory, we should ask whether the examination of skulls from ancient tombs affords us any evidence of the racial affiliations of the Sumerians. Up to the present time the results of two such investigations are available: L. H. Dudley Buxton's examination of the skulls found by

Assyria to 1000 B. C., London, 1928, pp. 49-52), by the resemblance of a bull pictured on a seal found by Woolley at Ur (*The Antiquaries' Journal*, Vol. VIII No. 1, Jan., 1928, p. 26 and pl. XI, no. 2) to the pictures of bulls on these Indian seals. It is doubtful, however, whether the characteristics referred to may not be due to psychological similarity, since they appear also on a prehistoric Egyptian plaque (see de Morgan, *Pré-histoire orientale*, II, 140). If there is a connection, it is difficult to think of its having originated in India.

¹⁶ P. W. Harrison, *The Arab at Home*, New York, 1924, p. 99.

Mackay at Kish,¹⁷ and Sir Arthur Keith's study of those found by Woolley at Tell-el-Ubaid.¹⁸

At Kish eight skulls were found in a prehistoric tomb. Of these, five Buxton found to be dolichocephalic in type, consistent in form and comparable to those of the pre-dynastic Egyptians, though with certain minor differences. Two of the skulls were brachycephalic or round-headed. The Brachycephals are divided by ethnologists into two classes. One is represented by the Alpine and other western races, the other by the Mongoloids. The round-headed skulls from Kish resembled the western rather than the eastern type. Buxton thinks the dolichocephalic skulls at Kish were those of Semites, while the round-headed skulls he thinks belonged to Sumerians. The indisputable facts of importance are the differences in the types of the skulls. Before accepting Buxton's interpretation, other facts should be considered.

Sir Arthur Keith's investigation is based on an examination of two groups of skulls; one from Tell-el-Ubaid, buried at the very dawn of history by a people who employed the Sumerian language and script, and who were presumably, therefore, Sumerians; the other from a cemetery at Ur containing bodies from 1900-1700 B. C., buried by people who spoke Akkadian. Keith found the Sumerians to be dolichocephalic with large brain capacity. Their skulls resembled remarkably those of the pre-dynastic Egyptians described by Morant,¹⁹ and Keith thinks that somatically the Sumerians and the pre-dynastic Egyptians had a common ancestry. He also regards them as belonging to the same race which today occupies Mesopotamia. It goes without saying that the present population of Iraq is largely Semitic and Arabic, since to our certain knowledge it has been overrun with wave after wave of Semites for the last 5000 years. He found here no trace of the round-headed Hittite or Mongoloid type. The skulls from the Semitic cemetery at Ur, 1900-1700 B. C., were of the same dolichocephalic type, but possessed a smaller brain-capacity. The inhabitants of Ur at this period were apparently intellectually considerably inferior to the people of Tell-el-Ubaid of two thousand years earlier. So far as the testimony of the skulls enables one to tell, however,

¹⁷ Published in Langdon's *Kish*, Paris, 1924. pp. 115-125.

¹⁸ Published in Hall and Woolley's *Excavation of Tell-el-Ubaid*, London and Philadelphia, 1927, pp. 214-240.

¹⁹ *Biometrika*, 1925, p. 1 ff.

they belonged to the same race. We know only from the testimony of the inscriptions that they were peoples speaking languages in no way related to one another.

These results are strikingly different from Buxton's, for Buxton thought the Sumerian round-headed. It must be remembered that Buxton was not guided by inscriptions in assigning his skulls to races, and that since he wrote our knowledge of the elements which might at this period enter into a Mesopotamian racial mixture has been increased. The researches of Chiera and Speiser have shown that the Hurri, or their round-headed predecessors, were in the Tigris valley. It follows that individuals of this race might easily have been buried in a pre-historic tomb at Kish. If we assign Buxton's round-headed skulls to this race, as doubtless we ought to do, it follows that his dolichocephalic skulls from Kish might be either Sumerian or Semitic. We could only decide, if we had written material from the same stratum.

The investigation of Sir Arthur Keith opens three possibilities. Either the inhabitants of El-Ubeid were Semites who employed the Sumerian language, or the substratum of the populace were Semites who were dominated by a foreign race of higher culture—a race which had imposed its language without being sufficiently numerous to change the racial type or the Sumerians were themselves descended from the dolichocephalic men of palaeolithic time, who had survived in some mountain fastness far from the Hamitic-Semitic center, and had developed an entirely different language. Of these three possibilities, the last seems to the present writer most probable. The round-headed peoples came from the north. We have already seen reason to think that the Sumerians came from the south. It is possible that their home-land was Oman, and that they were already inhabitants of eastern Arabia, when the Semites entered its western part from Africa.

ADDITIONAL NOTE

Since this manuscript left the writer's hands he has received Langdon's *Pictographic Inscriptions from Jemdet Nasr*, Oxford, 1928, in which Langdon claims to find indisputable philological evidence that the writers of these tablets were Sumerians. That indubitable evidence the present writer does not find in the tablets. Not only is the numerical system different from the Sumerian (a fact which convinced Thureau-Dangin that the people were not Sumerian), but there were also a number of other non-Sumerian elements. The most that can be said is that, in the later part of the period represented by these tablets, Sumerians were probably mingled with the other race.

BRIEF NOTES

A Letter of Saushshatar and the Date of the Kirkuk Tablets

One of the most debatable problems arising from the study of the so-called "Kirkuk"¹ material has been the question of the date to be assigned to this steadily increasing group of documents. In their attempts to determine the period in which the tablets are to be placed, scholars have hitherto been obliged to rely on internal evidence alone, and opinions differ as to the interpretation of this type of evidence. Thus Chiera and Speiser, who in 1926 presented a preliminary digest of the material that Dr. Chiera had dug up in Nuzi the year before, suggested the end of the first half of the second millennium.² A little later Gadd³ published the results of his very thorough study of the entire Kirkuk material that was accessible to him; he favored 1400 as the probable date of the inscriptions. A study of the *motifs* employed in the Kirkuk seals, of which the tablets bear numerous impressions, led Contenau to postulate a date identical to that which Gadd had suggested independently.⁴ Albright⁵ would place the new material somewhat later, with about 1300 as the lower terminus. And lastly, Koschaker,⁶ whose recent monograph on the new legal sources from the Amarna period forms an exceedingly valuable contribution to the subject, assigns the Kirkuk documents to the 14th century, although he reserves the last decades of the 15th as

¹ With the exception of about 50 tablets published by Gadd (see below), the extant "Kirkuk" records belong almost exclusively to *Nuzi*, now Yaghran Tepe, near the modern village of Tarkalan and about 10 miles SW. of Kirkuk. But since Kirkuk has become a "trade-name" for these documents, the misnomer will have to be tolerated and treated like "Hittite," "Aryan," and similar misleading connotations. There is also some disparity in the spelling of the name "Kirkuk"; the form "Kerkuk" is found quite frequently. The official British maps write "Kirkuk," which is based on the native spelling. For this reason the form with *k* appears preferable.

² Cf. *Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, vol. VI, "A New Factor in the History of the Near East," p. 83 f.

³ "Tablets from Kirkuk," *Revue d'Assyriologie*, vol. XXIII, p. 55.

⁴ *La glyptique syro-hittite*, pp. 158 ff.; "Les tablettes de Kerkouk et les origines de la civilisation Assyrienne," *Babyloniaca*, IX, pp. 36 ff.

⁵ *Journal of the Society of Oriental Research*, XI, 235.

⁶ *Neue Keilschriftliche Rechtsurkunden aus der El-Amarna-Zeit* (1928), p. 19.

a possibility. A margin of about three hundred years has thus been left open between the earliest and the latest dates suggested. In view of the widespread interest which the Kirkuk inscriptions have created, and particularly owing to their historical and linguistic significance, a difference of three centuries is not wholly inconsiderable; a further narrowing down of the margin of probability is certain, therefore, to be appreciated by all who have given the subject some attention and thought.

The joint expedition of Harvard University and the American School of Oriental Research in Baghdad was so fortunate as to unearth in its first campaign an inscription that enables us to assign at last an absolute date to the Kirkuk documents. Among the many hundreds of tablets that were brought to light in course of the excavations, Dr. Chiera, the director of the expedition, noticed one with a particularly beautiful seal impression. With the interest thus aroused the contents of the tablet were also examined. Fully in keeping with the excellent seal, the inscription proved to be a message from a king. Moreover, the writer was not one of the more or less insignificant local chieftains, but a ruler of a well-known and powerful empire. Not to anticipate any more, the letter and the inscription on the seal are given below in transliteration and translation.

Text^a

H(arvard) 146.

- a-na m̃it-l̃i-ia qí-bi-ma
 um-ma šarru-ma
 ʿpa-a'-ḫa-ar-ra-še(KI)
 ša a-na ʿam-mi-na-i-e ad-di-[in]
 5 i-na-an-na iš-tu li-e-ti-šu
 āla(KI) a-na m̃ú-gi at-ta-din
 a-nu-um-ma m̃sa-ta-ú-at-ti
 ʰḫal-zu-uh-lu ša ʿa-ti-lu(KI)
 a-na pātē^{pl}-šu-nu a-na šu-ú-li-i aš-ša-par
 10 ki-na-an-na a-na m̃sa-ta-ú-at-ti
 aq-ta-bi pāta-šu-mi
 ša ʿam-mi-na-i-e šu-ú-ma-mi
 m̃ú-gi-mi a-na pāti-šu-mi
 ša am-mi-na-i-e-mi
 15 lu la e-ir-ru-um-mi
 ù ʿam-mi-na-i-e-[mi?]

- a-na pāti-šu ša m^u-gi
 lu la e-ir-ru-um-mi
 ù a-na pāti-šu ša ^fam-mi-na-i-e
 20 ma-am-ma la e-ir-ru-ub
 āla(KI)-ka₄ a-na pāti-šu a-na ^fam-mi-na-i-e
 at-ta-din
 ù lu-ú ti-i-de₄

Seal

sa-uš-ša-tar
 mār pár-sa-ta-tar
 šar ma-i-te-ni

TRANSLATION

- To Ithiya speak:
 "So (says) the king,
 '(With regard to) ^ePaharrashe
 which I gave to ^fAmminaye,
 5 now, from its confines
 I have assigned a town to Ugi.
 Moreover, Satawatti,
 the magistrate of ^eAtilu,
 for the definition of their boundaries I have delegated.'
 10 Thus to Satawatti
 I spoke, The boundary
 of ^fAmminaye determine.
 Ugi upon the territory
 of ^fAmminaye
 15 shall not encroach;
 and ^fAmminaye
 upon the boundary of Ugi
 shall not encroach.
 Indeed, upon the boundary of ^fAmminaye
 20 no one shall encroach.
 Your (own) town to the district of ^fAmminaye
 I have assigned,
 and do you take notice.'"

Seal

Saushshatar,
 Son of Parsatatar,
 King of (the) Mitanni.

^a The transliteration is based on the system of Thureau-Dangin, *Le Syllabaire Accadien* (1926).

PHILOLOGICAL NOTES

The number H 146 indicates one of the 370 tablets that Dr. Chiera transliterated on the spot while the excavations were in progress. Of these, 107 inscriptions have been published by Dr. Chiera as a volume in the Harvard Semitic Series. A concordance of the numbers of the records transliterated and of the tablets copied is appended to that volume. The present letter is not included among the texts already copied; it will be published in a future volume. I am greatly indebted to Dr. Chiera for his permission to use his transliteration in the present instance, pending the publication of the text.

1. The name *Ithiya* occurs in an inscription on a seal belonging to H 345. The inscription reads: *mit-ḫi-ia šar ar-r [a-ap-ḫi? . . .]*. It is entirely probable that Saushshatar addressed his letter to the ruler of Arrapha, who acknowledged the suzerainty of Mitanni.

3. Other occurrences of the same name in the Harvard material thus far transliterated are: *cpa-a'-ḫa-ar-[. . .]*, H 322.17; *cpa-ḫar-ra-aš-wa*. H 325.3; *cpa-ḫa-ar-ri-wa*, H 346.17, and *cpa-ḫa-ar-ra-aš-wa*, H 346.33. The form found in this letter betrays its western origin by the suffixed determinative KI which is characteristic of a number of the Amarna letters; cf. e. g., *cgubla*, index in Knudtzon, 1574. The Syrian provenance of the present tablet is probably also responsible for the guttural in the name of the city. As can be seen from the letters of Tushratta, the western Hurrians (Mitanni) employed gutturals, probably under the influence of West-Semitic; the eastern branch of the Hurri (Arrapha) was not exposed to such influences and gutturals are here, therefore, scarcely ever indicated.

The ending *wa* has the value of '(the town) of,' or the like; (a)š and (a)še are obviously forms of the nominative ending. The simple form of the name was presumably *Paharra/i*.

5. *li-e-ti-šu* stands for *liwitišu*; the construct state of this noun is, in these tablets, the very common (*ina*) *lit*.

8. *luḫalzuḫlu* certainly represents a profession, as is shown by the determinative. Koschaker's doubts (cf. *l. c.*, p. 15) are therefore unjustified. The word is found (with the determinative) in the Amarna letters, Kn. 30.10; 67.15. In the former instance it occurs in connection with the typical Hurrian name Akiya, and should help to remove what doubts there are that the writer of the document was a Mitanni ruler (cf. commentary a.l.).

The *b.* accept deposition of witnesses in conjunction with judges, or by themselves. They are consequently 'elders,' or even better 'magistrates.'

9. *šuli* goes back to *šulucī*, cf. note to 5.

12. As a verb is expected here, *šu-ú-ma-mi* is best regarded as an impt. of *√šāmu* rather than as a pronoun (*šū-māmi* 'it (is)').

21. The town referred to is of course that of Satawatti and not of Ithiya.

NOTES ON THE LETTER

The interpretation of the message offers no particular difficulties. The king had formerly presented the woman Amminaye with the district of Paharrashe. A village in that district is now to be given to Ugi, whom the king apparently wishes to reward. The new boundaries are to be marked off by one Satawatti, the magistrate of the town of Atilu. To compensate Amminaye, however, for the loss of one of her possessions, Atilu is now assigned to the area of Paharrashe. Ithiya, a local dignitary to whom the letter is addressed,⁷ is personally responsible for the carrying out of the king's orders.

Interesting as this letter is in itself, the great importance of the document is not due to its contents but rather to the signature; the inscription on the seal is unusually valuable for more reasons than one. In the first place, the date of the Kirkuk tablets can now be established with absolute certainty. Saushshatar is the first known king of Mitanni and his date is to be placed soon after 1500 B. C.⁸ His contemporary Ithiya is probably the vassal ruler of Arrapha. The Nuzi records deal with at least five generations and we cannot tell as yet which of these synchronizes with the time of Saushshatar and of Ithiya. At all events the first two or three of these generations must now be placed in the 16th century. Nuzi, then, saw its best days a few hundred years earlier than the date which most scholars were inclined to allow it.

Significant is the comment which the letter furnishes as regards the political conditions of its time. Nuzi and the rest of Arrapha are under the unchallenged sway of Saushshatar. The Mitanni ruler is free to assign and to reassign districts and cities in Arrapha to whomever he pleases and the tone in which he addresses the local heads indicates that the king will brook no opposition. Ashur, which lay on the direct road from Mitanni to Arrapha, is completely ignored; obviously, Assyria was still in a state of submission and a province of Mitanni, precisely what we should expect in the 16th century. That the empire on the middle Euphrates was highly thought of in the West is abundantly illustrated in Egypt-

⁷ Cf. note to line 1.

⁸ Thotmes IV marries the daughter of Artatama, who is Saushshatar's successor. Saushshatar, then, must have been a contemporary of Thotmes III, whose reign began in 1501 B. C.

ian and Hittite sources, as well as in the Amarna letters; but that it should extend as far East as Arrapha and Nuzi was hardly expected by anyone. The presence of Mitannian colonies east of the Tigris throws a new light on the size and strength of the kingdom of Saushshatar. The writers of the Kirkuk tablets were related to the Hurri-Mitanni not only linguistically but also politically.

The message of Saushshatar adds two new names to the growing list of Indo-European words preserved in cuneiform records.⁹ Etymologically, the name of Satawatti, the magistrate of Atilu, may be simpler than that of Parsatatar; but historically the name of Saushshatar's father is of far greater importance. This is the first time that we can carry the Mitannian dynasty beyond its assumed founder, Saushshatar. It is indeed a curious thing that a comparatively obscure place east of the Tigris should supply this valuable bit of information, where the extant Hittite and Mitanni sources have hitherto failed us.

The last line of the seal is no less significant than the other two. Saushshatar calls himself here the king of *Maiteni*; this is evidently the uncontracted spelling of the name of the kingdom. Owing to the potential historical implications peculiar to this name, the discovery of an earlier form of the word is of considerable value. It is with this form that future attempts to solve the etymology of *Mitanni* will have to operate.¹⁰

Of more immediate consequence than the older writing of the name of the kingdom is the fact that Saushshatar remains king of *Maiteni*, although his country is consistently referred to in the Kirkuk documents as ^{mat}*Hanigalbat*. It follows conclusively that Hanigalbat was the geographical designation of the land, while Mitanni must have had a purely political connotation. In other words, the empire was that of the Mitanni but the country in which it was founded was Hanigalbat.¹¹ The introduction of the name *Maiteni* > *Mitanni* may now be attributed with greater plausibility

⁹ For the latest discussion of and literature on Indo-European linguistic material from Syria and Mesopotamia see the article of Johannes Friedrich in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*, pp. 144 ff.

¹⁰ Ungnad, *Kulturfragen* 12, suggested that the name may be ultimately connected with that of the Medes.

¹¹ Cf. Chiera-Speiser, *l. c.*, p. 77; for latest literature on the subject see Koschaker, *l. c.*, p. 18.

than was hitherto possible to the Indo-European ruling class that founded the kingdom. The word may, then, be after all connected with the name of the Medes.¹² But until this suggestion, tempting as it may be, can be supported by more convincing arguments it will remain as doubtful as it is interesting.

On this point the seal fails to furnish more information. Considering the number of problems which the three short lines have helped to illuminate we cannot really complain if some questions still remain unsettled. When our brief discussion was published less than three years ago, its authors had little hope of finding a number of their tentative and cautiously put forward suggestions established so soon. The work at Nuzi is going on and any chance find may prove as valuable as this exceedingly helpful letter.

E. A. SPEISER.

University of Pennsylvania.

¹² The passage from *Mat-ai* or *Ma-ta-ai* (the cuneiform designations for the Medes) to *Maite-ni* is simpler than to *Mita-ni*.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Stilgeschichte und Chronologie des Rgveda. Von WALTHER WÜST.
[*Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, XVII.
Band, Nr. 4.] Leipzig: DEUTSCHE MORGENLÄNDISCHE GE-
SELLSCHAFT (Brockhaus), 1928. xvi + 172 pp.

In spite of many studies based on linguistic, metrical, historical, and other data, only very meager results have come from attempts to formulate a relative chronology for the parts of the Rgveda. Everyone agrees that Books 2-7, and probably 9, are on the whole older than 1 and 10, and probably also than 8. But most scholars would qualify this by recognizing that the 'old' books contain 'late' verses and even entire hymns, and conversely that 'late' books contain some 'old' parts (cf. Bloomfield, *RVRep.* p. 649, on Book 10).

Dr. Wüst now presents a new and interesting attempt to solve this problem, by a detailed study of a kind of data which have never before been used in this connexion, on a comparable scale: namely, the data of what he calls 'stylistic history.' He holds it possible to trace, in the RV. itself, extensive stylistic developments. The later phases, he finds, approach the standards of later (classical) style. By strictly statistical methods, based on actual counting, he undertakes to determine which books of the RV. are stylistically later or earlier. He divides the number of words in each Book by the number of instances found therein of each of 17 such stylistic criteria, which he regards as 'late,' and thus finds their relative frequency in each Book. Assigning to each Book the number (from 1 to 10) which indicates that book's rank under each criterion, he then takes a mathematical average of these relative ranks, and puts the ten Books in an order of age which is settled by these average figures. E. g., since the average position of Books 2 and 6, in regard to their manifestation of these 17 phenomena, is exactly the same, 5.41, he assumes that they are both of about the same age; further, that they are younger than the Books (3, 4, 7, and 9) which show lower coefficients of rank, and older than only Book 5 of the family-books, because its coefficient is 5.88.

Wüst finds that the soundness of his method is supported by

the fact that his results show Book 10 as the latest, Book 1 next, and Book 8 third. Since on other grounds this much would be accepted by most scholars, he argues that we should also accept the rest of his hierarchy. He makes Book 9, the Soma Pavamāna book, the oldest of all as to date of composition of its materials (he accepts, p. 170, Oldenberg's view that it was made up of Pavamāna hymns which were originally contained in the other books). So far as I know, this is a wholly new suggestion. Unexpected, also, is his conclusion that Book 4 is the oldest of the family-books; Hopkins (*JAOS.* 16. 275) has called it 'perhaps the latest' of them.

What are these stylistic criteria? First, and most important to the author's mind, adjectival *ἄπαξ λεγόμενα*. Then, forms with *vṛiddhi* of secondary derivation; 'late suffixes'; certain types of noun compounds (those made up of more than two members; adjectival *dvandvas*; *tatpuruṣas* with case-form in the prius, etc.); reduplicated forms and *āmreḍitas*; numerical expressions; 'metrical' and 'philosophical' adjectives (these terms and some other of the categories need definition, and seem used somewhat loosely); 'adjektiva mit übertriebener Ausdruckssteigerung'; appositional *bahuvrīhis*, and a few others; it would take too much space here to make them all clear.

On many, indeed most, of these points Wüst's materials are certainly interesting and worthy of careful consideration. Some of them, at least, may with much plausibility be interpreted as indicating stylistic date. Everyone will see at a glance, however, that the treatment of them must require great tact, and that there are many pitfalls. That the author has successfully avoided a large number of them is true, and demonstrates his great learning, industry, and acumen. Yet it seems to me that he has occasionally stumbled. And—more important—I regret that I cannot find his general conclusions as compelling as he seems to consider them.

To begin with a point on which he lays great weight: the fact that *ἄπαξ λεγόμενα* are commonest in Book 10 may be partly a sign of lateness; but surely the subject-matter of 10 has something to do with it. Book 10 is mainly unhieratic. It contains almost all the 'Atharvanic,' 'popular,' and '*grhya*' materials: wedding and funeral hymns, charms, and other materials which deal with other subjects than the three-fire ritual to which almost all the rest of the RV. is devoted. (The philosophic hymns belong here

too, being, as I have recently observed—*JAOS.* 49. 97-121—as ‘Atharvanic’ as any charm.) In no other book are the topics so varied—are so many different things dealt with. In a collection dealing with such topics, whatever their date, we should expect to find many words not occurring in hymns devoted to praise of ritualistic gods and used in definitely limited ritual situations. Take the funeral hymns, 10. 14-18. According to Wüst’s statistics ¹ they show even more ἄπαξ λεγόμενα than the average of Book 10. Does this mean that they are later than the rest of Book 10? On Wüst’s principles this is what we should have to conclude. But it seems more natural to suppose that (if it is not a mere accident) it is due to the fact that these are, precisely, the only funeral hymns in the RV., and hence they almost had to use some words not found elsewhere. Like Bloomfield, ‘I cannot, for my part, imagine any Vedic time without just such, or nearly such, funeral stanzas’ (*RVRep.* p. 649).

Still less justified are some of Wüst’s conclusions about Book 9, which he makes the oldest of all—perhaps his most sensational dictum. That 9 has the fewest ἄπαξ λεγόμενα is exactly what we should expect, for it is the converse of Book 10 in the respect just described. All its hymns deal not only with one god (Soma), but with one ritual aspect of that god (S. Pavamāna), and were intended for use at a very limited set of closely related ritual situations. So they are all closely and monotonously similar in language. ‘Es wäre nicht möglich, aus dem Hymnenschatz des RV. eine zweite ähnlich compacte Masse von inhaltlich und formell so durchaus gleichartigen Liedern auszuziehen’ (as the 9th Book: Oldenberg, *Proleg.* p. 250). Hence, Book 9 ‘for the most part repeats itself’ (Bloomfield, *RVRep.* p. 644). If it were possible to perform the feat which Oldenberg has just been quoted as declaring impossible, we should find that such an equally extensive group of hymns equally unified in subject-matter would be equally unified in style too, equally self-repetitious, and with equally few ἄπαξ λεγόμενα. And that without reference to the date of such hymns. Why Wüst considers the self-repeating quality of Bk. 9 ‘ein Beweis seines hohen Alters’ (p. 169) is utterly incompre-

¹ For Wüst furnishes, on 48 pages, a complete table of the data under each of his 17 criteria for every single hymn of the RV.! His figures show 1: 41 or 42 words as the proportion of ἄπ. λεγ. in 10. 14-18; for Book 10 as a whole, 1: 43.

hensible to me. It seems to me obvious that it is nothing of the sort. It is a proof only of the fact that Rigvedic poets, when dealing with identical situations, tend strongly to use identical language. The RV. contains just five funeral hymns; if it contained over 100, as it does hymns to Soma Pavamāna, we might find in them no more ἀπαξ λεγόμενα, because these latter would be repeated!

The repeated pādas found both in Book 9 and in the other books are, indeed, perhaps too few in number to warrant any deductions. Still, they amount to nearly a hundred, according to my count from *RVRep*. The majority are inconclusive on the question of relative age and originality; but they tend rather against than for Wüst's view of the antiquity of Book 9. To be sure, Bloomfield (p. 644) considers that Book 8 is regularly secondary to 9 in the repetitions, which are particularly numerous between these books. But this means little, since 8 is equally secondary to all the family-books (p. 642). From a study of Bloomfield's treatment of the repetitions between 9 and the other books (be it noted that I have counted only cases on which an opinion was expressed by Bloomfield, who certainly was not prejudiced against the antiquity of 9), I find that he considers Book 9 inferior and secondary to Books 2-7 in some seven or eight cases, to Book 1 in four cases, and even to Book 10 in two cases; while he mentions five cases in which 9 is superior to 1, but not a single case in which he finds it superior to 2-7 or 10. (He expresses no opinion as to relative originality in some 25 repetitions between 9 and 2-7, some 25 between 9 and 1, and 6 between 9 and 10.) Considering these facts, is it not more likely that the stylistic peculiarities of 9 which Wüst discovers, in so far as they have any real significance, may be due to the very narrow limits of the subject-matter of 9? It may perhaps be granted that the hymns of 9 would average *as old* as any in the family-books; but I doubt whether they are older than the general run of ritualistic hymns. Certainly Wüst has not proved it, if they are. I suggest that similar peculiarities (*all negative ones*, be it noted—absence of certain peculiarities assumed to be late) would probably appear in any like collection of hymns, taken from the family books, dealing with a special ritualistic sphere—if such an other collection were possible.

It must be added that some of Wüst's criteria will not bear close examination. Take his list of 'diminutives,' p. 82 f. It

contains nearly 100 words ending in *-ka* or *-la*. To save space he omits to explain why he considers them 'diminutives'; a very unfortunate omission, for the diminutive character of many of them is, to put it mildly, far from self-evident. (There are not a few other places in which Wüst's account lacks clarity and force, owing to over-compression.) In some of them the *-k* or *-l* is clearly not even suffixal at all, but radical (e. g. *srká*, cf. Avestan *haraka-*, and the verb *haracaya-*); in others the *-ka* or *-la*, if it is suffixal, is apparently primary, not based on an antecedent noun-stem, and hence certainly not diminutive (e. g. *śūla*, which moreover is wholly obscure, so that there is no reason for assuming that the *l* is suffixal; *nihākā*, *pāka*, and others have primary *-ka*); in others the suffix, if secondary, is not or need not be diminutive (*udaká*, explained *JAOS.* 31. 115; *antiká*; *sāyaka*, which moreover is probably primary; *sómaka*, see *JAOS.* 31. 124; and many others); many (e. g. *pipālā*, *śīpāla*) are too obscure in formation and etymology to be even discussed, and certainly no arguments should be based on any supposed 'diminutive' value in them. On the other hand, Wüst omits some real diminutives: *muhuká*, for unexplained reasons (cf. *JAOS.* 31. 128), and *álakam*, which he nowhere mentions but which is a certain diminutive (*ibid.* 138). His list is, in short, hopelessly imperfect. But even if it were a good list, it would not tend to prove his point; rather the opposite. Abundant use of diminutives is *not* a characteristic of later (classical Skt.) style as contrasted with the Veda; on the contrary, certain spheres of Vedic language show much more extensive use of them than ever appears at any period of the later language. One of these spheres is, to be sure, that of magic (Atharvanic) charms (tho Wüst, p. 83, utterly misunderstands the meaning of this phenomenon; most diminutives in magic are *imprecatory*, not 'liebevoll' or 'zärtlich'; so specifically *manaská* in *AV.* 6. 18. 3 which he quotes, cf. *JAOS.* 31. 142). But this means not a 'later' but rather a *lower* sphere of language. In other words, if Wüst's list of diminutives and his general method were reliable, he should draw from them exactly the opposite inference; they would show a stylistic tendency the reverse of that which prevails later. Whitney, § 1243, is much nearer right on this point than Wüst, who rashly and cavalierly rejects his statement; and on a matter of this kind Whitney's statements are not to be lightly rejected! The diminutive use of *-ka* was never wholly lost, but became ex-

tremely rare in Skt. literature (I am extremely sceptical of some of the few cases alleged for it), presumably because of the very extensive development of wholly different uses of *-ka* (and its derivative suffixes, *-aka*, *-ika*, etc.).

On p. 47 Wüst is wholly in error in his assumption of the 'late suffix *-ika*' for a small group of RV. words, every one of which is a feminine (*-ikā*) to an actual or presumptive masculine in *-a-ka* (Whitney, § 1222i; the writer, *JAOS.* 31. 95 f., 311 f.; I may be pardoned for suggesting that Wüst might have been helped in his treatment of *-ka* forms if he had consulted this monograph). The masculine *iyattakā* actually occurs in the RV., and '*iyattika*,' quoted by Wüst, is non-existent. Equally imaginary are '*śitika*' (for which on p. 82 Wüst himself has, correctly, *śitaka*), '*hlādika*,' and '*sulābhika*'; the (hypothetical) masculine forms of all these words would certainly end in *-a-ka*. The only real *-ika* form in the RV. is *śāṇḍika*, n. pr., if (as I think likely, *JAOS.* 31. 296) it is to be derived, with Sāyaṇa, from the YV. name *śāṇḍa*. And this is *not* mentioned by Wüst!

We see that some of Wüst's materials have been chosen and used without sufficient care. I would not suggest that these instances are typical; most of the others make a better impression on me. But even if we accepted all his evidence, would his conclusions follow necessarily? I have suggested grave doubts as to the precedence of Book 9 over the family books. When we come to the relative position of the family books themselves, Wüst's own statistics (p. 152) cause even more serious qualms to arise. In the case of Book 10, which ranks last among the 10 books in 9 out of 17 criteria, 9th in one, and 8th in 5, we may concede that such data are apt to mean *something*, viz. that the style of Book 10 probably really differs from that of the rest (tho this difference need not be based necessarily or wholly on 'lateness'). But when it comes to comparing the family-books with one another, we find no such regular precedence, nor anything resembling it. Wüst has to resort to mathematical averages, and I question whether any sound conclusions can be drawn from such procedure. To take a specific case: in the ranking according to rarity of the 17 supposedly 'late' criteria, Book 2 appears once as No. 1 among the 10 books, twice as No. 2, twice as No. 4, four times as No. 5, thrice as No. 6, twice as No. 7, thrice as No. 9. Book 3 appears twice as No. 1, thrice as No. 2, twice as No. 3, once as No. 4, five

times as No. 5, twice as No. 7, and twice as No. 10. Book 2 ranks *ahead* of Book 3 in *seven* criteria, and follows it in ten. Consider, now, (a) that some of these criteria are very minor and show very few instances in any given book; and (b) that in many cases the differences in frequency, on which these rankings are based, are extremely slight, the actual figures for the different books being often almost identical. Are we then justified in concluding that Book 2 is 'late' and Book 3 'old' (Wüst, p. 165), solely because the *average* position of Book 3 among the ten books is 4.53, and that of Book 2 is 5.41? A pretty sweeping conclusion from extremely flimsy premises, it seems to me.

In short, while many of the detailed results presented by Wüst are interesting and important, the reviewer is regretfully obliged to conclude (1) that his method needs much perfecting before it can be relied upon to prove anything; and further (2) that it is likely to be of use only to an extent just as limited as the force of other criteria has proved to be, and only in confirmation of those other results; for instance, as to the special character of Books 10, 1, and 8. That this special character is *in part* due to actual lateness of composition has long been recognized; more than this is not likely to be proved by Wüst's methods. It would certainly be premature to accept his dating of Book 9. As to Books 2-7, the data he presents seem rather to confirm the previous general pessimism, and to suggest that their relative chronology is likely to remain 'a perfect tangle' (Bloomfield, *RVR* p. 644). We must, however, thank Dr. Wüst for the loving zeal with which he has prepared, arranged, and presented his enormous mass of materials; he has made it relatively easy to criticize his work, and that is no small merit.

The Mahābhārata. For the first time critically edited by VISHNU S. SUKTHANKAR, Ph. D. Poona: BHANDARKAR ORIENTAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE. Ādiparvan: Fascicule 2 (1928), and Fascicule 3 (1929). Pp. 61-232 of entire work.

The first sixty pages of this work, constituting Fascicule 1, were reviewed in this JOURNAL, 48. 186-190. As to the general character of the work, its importance, and the methods with which it has

been conducted, there is nothing to add or modify. The two new fascicules continue in the same admirable way the work begun in the first; and the unanimous praise with which Fasc. 1 was greeted by all the Sanskritists of the world is sufficient guarantee that the confidence expressed by our former review was not misplaced. The text is here brought down to 1.53.36 (in 1.59 of the vulgate).

Attention will be called here to a few new matters of interest. Dr. Sukthankar's materials have been increased by several valuable new manuscripts. Of overwhelming importance is the unique ancient Śāradā ms. which he calls Ś1, which originally contained the first three parvans of the epic. It is unfortunately fragmentary, and lacks much of the Ādi, including the beginning; collation of it therefore begins on page 147, with 1.26.10. Fortunately there is a complete Devanāgarī ms. of Ādi (K1) which Sukthankar shows to have been a copy of a codex very closely allied to Ś1; and there are also several other mss. in Devanāgarī (the 'K' group), which likewise belong to the Kashmirian recension. Probably the most brilliant result of Sukthankar's work is his convincing demonstration that this Kashmirian recension, of which virtually nothing was previously known, is the oldest and best version of the epic now extant. No one who studies the critical apparatus will doubt this fact.

Of other mss. used for the first time in Fasc. 2 and 3, unquestionably the most important are the three Newari mss., described in the editorial note at the beginning of Fasc. 2; their collation begins with 1.3 (or, in the case of one of them, with 1.14; this fact regarding the use of ms. 'Ñ3' is not stated in the editorial note). This is also a hitherto unknown recension, and an important one; it shows many agreements with the Kashmirian version.

On the other hand, Dr. Sukthankar has dropped from his critical apparatus the variant readings of 14 mss. which were collated for Fasc. 1: eleven Devanāgarī mss. of the vulgate northern recension, two of the Kashmirian recension, and one Grantham ms. (This fact is stated on p. 63; it would have been well, perhaps, to make the statement more prominent by including it in the editorial note at the beginning of Fasc. 2.) The reason for this procedure is that these mss. have proved to be contaminated and of very little value for the critical text. Users of the text will be very grateful to the editor for ceasing to burden his notes with such material which has

come to appear practically valueless. It is as much the duty and the sign of a good editor to know what *not* to say as to know what to say, and Sukthankar proves on both counts that he deserves to rank among the best of editors.

FRANKLIN EDGERTON.

Yale University.

Woodbrooke Studies: Christian Documents in Syriac, Arabic and Garshūni. Edited and translated with a Critical Apparatus by A. MINGANA, with two Introductions by RENDEL HARRIS. Vol. 2. Reprinted from the "Bulletin of the John Rylands Library," Volume 12, 1928. W. HEFFER & SONS, Cambridge, 1928. Pp. 332.

It is most commendable that Dr. Harris is concerned to republish in permanent book form the valuable texts appearing in his *Bulletin*, for journals are often honorary tombs for the best scholarship. The present volume continues the pace set by its predecessor in publishing three new documents, all completely edited by Dr. Mingana, along with brilliant introductions from Dr. Harris's hand. Two of these are Karshūni texts (Arabic in Syriac script), and are documents of a well-known Christian *genre*, both, as the editors hold, of Egyptian origin, parallels existing in the Coptic, and a reference to the Coptic language appearing, p. 254. One of these is the Lament of the Virgin, edited from two MSS. in Dr. Mingana's Collection, with a colophon alleging that it was written by Gamaliel and Nicodemus (p. 210); the other is the Martyrdom of Pilate edited from two MSS. of Dr. Mingana's and a third one in Paris; it claims to have been composed by Gamaliel (p. 280). The materials of the two are akin to the well-known *Acta Pilati* and *Gospel of Nicodemus*. How Pilate became a Christian saint and martyr is illuminatingly told by Dr. Harris. I may note his interesting remark upon ἐν Ποντίῳ Πειλάτου in 1 Tim. 6, 13, as an early creedal formula (p. 167).

But it is the first document in the volume, The Apology of Timothy, as the editor entitles it, which will claim the most general interest. For it is nothing less than the report of a discussion be-

tween the Caliph Mahdi (775-785) and the Nestorian Patriarch Timothy I (780-823), in which the latter makes apology for the Christian faith by way of "question and answer" between him and the Caliph. For this document the 144 pages of the Syriac MS. (a copy in Mingana's possession of a 13th century MS. at Al Kosh, destroyed in the late war by the Kurds) are given in photographic reproduction. The plates are beautifully clear, and we may take note that at least in America it is far more practicable, as regards cost and accuracy, to reproduce texts in this way than by reprinting in types. The one oversight in the editing is that cross-pagination to the text is not given in the translation; the similar fault has been committed in Gollancz's translation of *Julian the Apostate*, which has just appeared. It is therefore almost impossible to control the translation at any given point. The Apology, which covers a two days' debate, is a veritable human document. Unlike the formal rhetorical arguments of early Christian apologetic, which never reached their destination, we have here evidently a report of an actual debate between the third Abbaside Caliph and a doughty Christian apologist, the Pope of his Communion. It contains such fresh personal coloring, in question and answer and repartee, in gentle civility and mutual respect between the two distinguished parties, that it can hardly be regarded as a romance. As an argument for Christianity it arouses our respect for Timothy's intellect and logic, even if to be sure, the composition is a one-sided report. It equally presents the Caliph as an open-minded and tolerant ruler, who could brook the Christian's stout defence, which involved the denial of Mohammad. And altogether it throws a welcome light upon the relations of the two religions under the early Abbasides, upon which we are too ill informed. An extensive polemical literature must have existed between the two parties; from the Christian side little is known beyond al-Kindi's *Risālah*. The document is recommended to the reading of both the theologian and also the student of Abbaside culture.

The reviewer has read the larger part of this fascinating document in the Syriac, and would congratulate the editor on the elegance of his translation, often necessarily periphrastic, but correct in interpretation. As an earnest of my interest I call attention to a few slips in translation, mostly omissions. P. 24, l. 19 =

text, p. 99, col. 1, I would translate the passage beginning "it teaches also" thus: "it teaches also about the Spirit in the same passage [Jn. 1, 4]: that is, in Him, the God-Word, was (*hewā*) life, and that is, was Spirit, and this it *was-essentially* (*'ithāu* (*h*)*wā*, vs. *hewā*)," the argument proceeding to discuss the eternity of the Spirit. And a few lines below, for "Jesus Christ (Holy Ghost) [*sic*] is the Spirit of God and the life and light of men," the original has "the Spirit of God is the life," etc. P. 43, l. 11 = text p. 116, col. 2, in an argument upon the responsibility of the Jews for the death of Christ, the Caliph holding that the death was predestined and the Jews therefore blameless, in place of "he bore both crucifixion and death at the hands of the Jews," read "not by the hands of the Jews did he die or was killed; the cross he suffered from the Jews, his death of his own free will." P. 26, l. 16 to "Without space and time" add "and mass" (*ṭūrā*, cf. Arabic). P. 47, add to end of last paragraph, = p. 121, col. 1, "in the likeness of tongues of fire in the upper chamber; and it gave them knowledge of secret things; and it taught them different and divers tongues, which they knew not; it gave them power to do miracles and signs and wonders. It wrote and delivered without change. For not by their own knowledge did they write and finish, but what they saw with their eyes and heard with their ears from the Lord Christ; and whatever the Spirit Paraclete reminded them of, this they wrote and delivered to us." This long omitted passage is the necessary prelude to the ensuing question of the Caliph.

JAMES A. MONTGOMERY.

University of Pennsylvania.

Zoroastrian Studies: the Iranian Religion and Various Monographs. By A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON. [Columbia University Indo-Iranian Series.] New York: COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1928. xxxiv + 325 pp.

We now have, in the first 215 pages of this volume, the English original of Professor Jackson's treatise on *The Iranian Religion*, which was printed in a German version, translated by Professor A. F. J. Remy, in Geiger and Kuhn's *Grundriss der Iranischen Philologie*, 2. 612-708, Strassburg, 1903, with the title *Die ira-*

nische Religion. The author has made considerable additions throughout, along with some minor alterations and a few excisions; the new material is generally, but not always, enclosed in square brackets. The numbering of the paragraphs is the same as that of the German version; but § 92a and § 109a are added, as well as the *Addendum on Manichaeism*, pages 187-193. The chapter on *The Moral and Ethical Teachings of the Ancient Zoroastrian Religion* is given not in the form in which it appeared in *GIP.*, but in an amplified form in which it was printed in the *International Journal of Ethics*, 7. 55-62 (1896), as well as in *The Evolution of Ethics as revealed in the Great Religions*, 143-155, edited by E. H. Sneath (New Haven, 1927). The bibliography, which is very full, is augmented by perhaps 50%, as compared with the German version—a most important feature, since this treatise, of first importance for primary sources, is now again up to date in the secondary literature also.

The reviewer greatly admires Professor Jackson's distinguished scholarship, but is at times inclined to accuse him of a too thorough-going acceptance of Parsi tradition. For instance, Professor Jackson still adheres to the traditional date of Zoroaster, 660-583 B. C. (page 17 n.), despite strong reasons for setting it distinctly earlier. In like manner he accepts the developed doctrine of the Amshaspands for the Gathic period (§ 34), though elsewhere (§ 4) he insists, very properly, on the importance of distinguishing at least three stages in the development of the religion—the pre-Zoroastrian period, the Zoroastrian stage, the post-Zoroastrian evolution. But the Gathas may be consistently interpreted on the basis that the terms which in the later Parsi texts designate the Amshaspands or Archangels are in the Gathas only abstract terms; for the demonstration of this, reference may be made to the doctoral dissertation of Miss Maria Wilkins Smith, shortly to appear in the series of *Language Dissertations* of the Linguistic Society of America. One notes with regret that Professor Jackson now withdraws the promise of a special treatise on the Amshaspands (§ 33 and § 35 end, in the German edition).

In connection with the plant and drink *haoma* (later *hōm*), later deified, Professor Jackson makes a most misleading statement (p. 62 = § 40. 21): "neither the genius Haoma nor the plant *haoma* is mentioned in the Gāthās." This is true in the letter, but not in

the spirit; for there are two Gathic passages which mention the *haoma*, if not by name, yet by unmistakable periphrases. In *Yasna* 32. 14, the followers of the Druj are inveighed against as slaying cattle for their orgiastic rites in honor of the *duraoša*; and *duraoša* is in later Avestan texts a standing epithet of the *haoma*. In *Yasna* 48. 10, Zoroaster appeals to Mazdāh to know when he will strike down *mūθrēm ahyā madahyā* 'the filth of this intoxicating drink', which the leaders of the old false religion employ as a means of misleading their followers; this cannot be other than the *haoma*. We have here a most important point, that in the original religion of Zoroaster the *haoma* had no place; it was even a central point in the ceremonies of the worship which he was attacking. Obviously we must recognize an early Zoroastrian religion without the *haoma*, and a later form in which it was established when, with the spread of Zoroaster's doctrines, proselytism in mass entailed the importation of certain non-original practices. Such has been the experience of most religions, if not of all, and this important step in the history of Zoroastrianism should not be passed over in silence; yet mention of it in Professor Jackson's book utterly eludes the reviewer.

The second part of the volume (pages 217-244) is devoted to *The Zoroastrian Doctrine of the Freedom of the Will*. We find the important passages on this problem given in original and in translation, in chronological order—Gathic, later Avestan, Pahlavi, Muhammadan, with careful treatment of the evidence.

Part III consists of *Miscellaneous Zoroastrian Studies*: *On Some of the Proposed Explanations of Zoroaster's Name* (247-248; summary in *Deut. Lit.-Ztg.* 26. 917 [1905]), *A Reference in Theodore bar Khoni to Zoroaster's Date* (249-251); *An Allusion to Zoroaster's Death as found in Tha'ālibī's Arabic History of the Kings of Persia* (251-255); *The Cypress of Kashmar and Zoroaster* (255-266); *An Observation regarding a Zoroastrian Simile in Bundahishn 30. 10* (266-267); *Some Additional Data on Zoroaster* (268-278; reprinted with additions and changes, from *Orientalische Studien Th. Nöldeke zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*, 2. 1031-1038, Giessen [1906]); *The Religious Interest which Seistān has historically for Zoroastrians* (279-286; reprinted with some additions, from *Sanj Varatman*, Bombay, Sept. 9, 1926). The volume concludes with a detailed index (287-325), the work of Mrs. Louis H. Gray.

These *Studies*, though some are in part reprinted, are in truth a "new contribution" (see preface, page vii), welcome to Iranists everywhere.

ROLAND G. KENT.

University of Pennsylvania.

NOTES OF THE SOCIETY

The following persons have been elected to membership by vote of the Executive Committee:

Mr. James Devadasan
Mr. Murray B. Emeneau
Prof. R. D. Jameson
Prof. H. A. F. Kern

Rev. Allan A. MacRae
Dr. W. F. Stutterheim
Mr. F. E. Wood

NOTES OF OTHER SOCIETIES

Notice should have been printed earlier in this JOURNAL of the foundation in 1926 of a new Oriental journal in India, the *Journal of Oriental Research*, published at Madras under the editorship of Mahamahopadhyaya Vidyavacaspati S. KUPPUSWAMI SASTRI, M. A., I. E. S., Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology in the Presidency College, Madras. Professor Kuppuswami Sastri's name is well known to scholars; he is a man deeply learned in the traditional scholarship of India, and also at home in western orientalist learning, a very felicitous combination which, we are glad to say, is becoming commoner in India every year. The journal founded by him reflects his tastes and attainments, which is, and is intended to be, high praise. It is now (1929) in its third volume. We welcome this valuable addition to the field and wish it long life and every success.

PERSONALIA

Professor A. T. Olmstead of the University of Illinois has gone to the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago as Professor of Oriental History, the change taking effect September 1st.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

RESPECTING GRANTS IN AID OF RESEARCH

The American Council of Learned Societies is able to offer a limited number of grants to individual scholars to assist them in carrying on definite projects of research in the humanistic sciences: philosophy; philology, literature, and linguistics; archaeology and art; musicology; history, especially all branches of cultural and intellectual history, but

exclusive of those branches that are essentially social, economic, and political history; and auxiliary sciences.

The grants are of two categories:

A. *Small grants*, designed to encourage research by scholars who are trained in scientific methods of investigation. The normal maximum of the small grants is \$300, which may be increased to not more than \$500 if such increase appears to the Committee on Fellowships and Grants to be justified by the necessity of incurring unusual expenses, as for foreign travel.

B. *Larger grants*. These are designed primarily to assist in the advancement of knowledge and are reserved for mature scholars of demonstrated ability in constructive research, who should be able to devote at least six months of uninterrupted work to their investigations. The larger grants range in amount from \$750 to \$2000.

Applicants for both categories of grants must be citizens of the United States or Canada or permanently employed or domiciled therein; they must be actually engaged in the research for which they request assistance, and must personally be in need of the aid for which they apply.

Applicants should possess a doctor's degree or its equivalent in training, study, and experience. No grants will be made to assist in the fulfilment of requirements for any academic degree.

Applications must be made in triplicate upon special forms provided for that purpose, and must be mailed to the Permanent Secretary of the American Council of Learned Societies, 907 Fifteenth Street, Washington, D. C., not later than January 15. Awards will be made in March.

When requesting application blanks, prospective applicants are requested to indicate for which category of grant they intend to apply.

RESPECTING RESEARCH FELLOWSHIPS IN THE HUMANITIES

The American Council of Learned Societies is enabled to offer a certain number of post-doctoral Research Fellowships in the Humanities. The purpose of these Fellowships is to provide opportunities for further training and experience in humanistic research to a limited number of younger scholars of unusual ability selected from among those who have demonstrated unmistakable aptitude for constructive scholarship.

Applications and proposals must be presented to the Committee on Fellowships and Grants on or before January 15 of each year. They should be made in triplicate on forms which will be provided upon request; and should include references, by permission, to three scholars, well acquainted with the applicants, who will be invited to supply such information as may be needed by the Committee.

Applicants must be citizens of the United States or Canada or permanently domiciled or employed therein. They must have attained the doctorate or, in the judgment of the Committee, its equivalent in training and experience. They must not, ordinarily, be more than thirty-five (35) years of age, and they must be possessed of good health and habits and be in sound physical condition. A physical examination may be required of applicants at the discretion of the Committee.

A FURTHER FRAGMENT ON ASTROLOGY FROM THE GENIZAH

RICHARD J. H. GOTTHEIL
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

IN Vol. XLVII, pp. 302-310, I published a small Arabic fragment coming from the Genizah, dealing with astrology. I shall not repeat what I said there (p. 304) concerning the value of studying what may seem to be the absurdity of the foolish. The whole subject, since I wrote my previous article, has been discussed with much consequent illumination by Professor Alexander Marx, in the *Hebrew Union College Annual*, Vol. 3, pp. 311 et seq.

I have gone to the trouble of having certain leaves photographed which are the remnant of another work on astrology, and which are to be found in Bodleian MS. Heb. D. 36. Even among these leaves a few pages are missing. The script is good, square Hebrew; the language, of course, Arabic. These pages are probably part of a larger work. The letters א of the article are in nearly every case written as one character. Occasionally a point is used, to mark off a sentence, and a small circle in which is a dot, to mark off a paragraph. The Arabic is not always classic; and, at times, one wonders at the manner in which Arabic words and forms are transcribed;

e. g. $\text{آخره} = \text{אכירוה}$; $\text{في نصفه} = \text{פי נצפה}$; $\text{وحاجبه} = \text{והאגבוה}$
(though, in one place, this is written אכרוה); $\text{له} = \text{לוה}$; $\text{فانوه} =$

فانه ; $\text{موتوه} = \text{מותוה}$ —unless in all these cases and in similar ones, the writer is thinking in the ordinary spoken Arabic of his day, and adds the letter ה merely for form's sake. Cfr. אבו in the fragment published by Hirschfeld in the *JQR.*, XVI 279—though this has to do with a proper name only.

I am certain that I have gone wrong in translating many sentences and words. At times, however, we are confronted with a veritable jumble; and it is not easy to render such into readable English. It is much more trivial than the Book of Augury—also from the Genizah—published and explained by the late Professor I. Friedlaender in the *JQR.*, XIX, 84 et seq. But the whole subject is of historic importance, as Loth suggests that astrology was born

in Persia and carried by the Jews to the Arabs. See *Morgenländische Forschungen* (Leipzig 1875), p. 267.

fol. 43 recto.

1. אלוה וחאנבוה דקאק וחלו אלכלאם ויקצי חואיג אל
2. נאם כלהום ויסתחי יסאל פאן סאל לא יראד וצאחב
3. חק ויבגץ אלכאטל ועאקל ופאהם אלסראיר *
4. ומן תואלד פי נצפוח יכון צעיף אלכלקה ופואע מן
5. כל שי * ומן תואלד פי אכירוה יכון צאחב פראש *
6. ומן תואלד פי אלעקרב יתאלף אלאשיא ויאמן במן
7. יקול לזה שי וקטאל וקראץ ויכון אסמר ובראק אל
8. עינין ואסע אלאכתאף ורקיק אלסאקין * ומן
9. תואלד פי נצפוח יכון עאקל וגני * ומן תואלד פי
10. אכרוה יכון מסכין וקטאל * ומן תואלד פי א...
11. אלקוס יכון גבאר ופארס ואן כאן מן אהל אל ...
12. פאנוה ילי ולא יכאף מן רגול ורקיק אלסאקין ...
13. ובראק אלעינין ואסמר * ומן תואלד פי אכירוה]
14. יכון כייר ויכאפי בכייר * ומן תואלד [פי]
15. אול אלגרי יכון גני ואודניה כבאר ויכון מותה
16. באלסיף או באלכנאק * ומן תואלד פי אכירוה]

fol. 43 verso.

1. יכון גני וצכם אלגסד * ומן תואלד פי אכירוה יכון
2. מסכין ויכון אחיל * ומן תואלד פי אול אל דלו
3. יכון טויל וסאקיה טואל ולא יכון עאקל וצאחב חמיה
4. יכון ויגיבוה אלעיב פי עיניה פי כל סנה * ומן יתואלד
5. אול אלחות יכון צליף וסארק ותחדת פי עיניה אל
6. עיוב וריח יכון פי אנפה * ומן תואלד פי אכירוה
7. ישול עומרוה * הדא באב אכר *
8. מן כאן אלכבש יחרוה פאינוה יכון חראת ויכסב מעה
9. ויכון לה ארבע אכנה ויכון לה עיב פי גונבוה אלאיסר
10. ויכון לה ג אואלד או ז ויכון כתיר אלאמראץ ויתווג
11. ג נסוה וימות מות חסן ואכירוה ינגח פי כסב אל
12. מואשי ואל אנניא יחבוה ואלמסאכין יבנצוה *
13. מן כאן אלתור יחרוה יתואלד בעדוה צבייה
14. ויכון מותעב אלכרן ויאכל כתיר גרוז מתל אל בהאים
15. ואמראצוה כתירה ויתווג ז נסוה ויכסב אלמאל ודוקוה
16. ואכר יכון ושראיקוה מעונה ואהל ביתוה יכונו
17. מסאכין *

חלום תעצובו ידיו ו...
 יום טובו ו...
 חר ובענין לבוש...
 ופועלם...
 כל שיש...
 וקונטרס פה...
 יהיה לה שי קראת וכן אמר בצורה
 בן ואם איכתאך תקין לאחת...
 הולך כי עצמו וכן עמנו וכו' וכו'
 אכילה ופסח...
 סוכה ובאר דברים ואזכור את צאת
 הארץ ולא...
 גב אצל עיניו ואמר...
 וכן כולד וכאשר...
 הוא לבי וכו' ואומר רשעים...
 בעולם איבד כלים...

[illegible][illegible]

[illegible]

- fol. 44 recto.
1. ומן כאן אלתומאן יהרוזה יתואלד בעדוה דכר ויכון הו
 2. מְבִסֵּד אֲלִידִין וְכִיִּים וְעִזִּיו וְאֶעֱמָאִלוּהוּ צִעָאָף וְלֹא
 3. יִרְתֵּן מִן מֶאֱל אֲבוּהֵם שִׁי וִיכּוֹן לֹוֹה זֵ אֲבוּהֵם וְזֵ אֲוֵלָאָד אֹו זֵ
 4. וְאֶמְרָאָצוּהוּ קִלִּילָה וִיתּוּזֵן מִרְתִּין וִיעֲטֵם שְׁאֲנוּהֵם פִּי אֵל
 5. אֲכִיר וְעִשׂוּהוּ חֶסֶן וְיִמּוֹת מוֹת חֶסֶן °
 6. וּמִן כֹּאן אֶלְסֶרְטָאן יִחְרוּזָה יתואלד בעדוה אֲנָתִי וִיכּוֹן
 7. גְּנִי וְעֵאקֵל וִיכּוֹן רֵאִיָּה גִיר מִתְעוֹב וְיִלְד כְּנֵאת כְּתִירָה
 8. וְאֶמְרָאָצוּהוּ רִדִּיָּה וִיתּוּזֵן נֶסֶא כְּתִירָה וְיִטְעוּהוּ אֲחִיכֵבֵאָה
 9. וְטֵרֵאִיקוּהוּ חֶסֶנָה וְאֶעֱדָאָה קִיִּין אֲקוּא מְנָה וּמוֹתוּהוּ
 10. טוִילָה ° וּמִן כֹּאן אֶלְאֶסֶד יִחְרוּזָה יתואלד בעדוה
 11. דְּכֵר וִיקְטַלּוּהוּ וִיכּוֹן טֵאֶעֶם שְׁאֶרֶב כָּל אִיאִם חֵיאתוּהוּ
 12. וּמוֹתִנֵּאֶעֶם וְלֹא יִתְרוֹכ מֶאֱל וְלִגִּירוּהוּ יִתְעַב נֶפְסוּהוּ וְכָל
 13. אֲחִיבֵאָה שְׂרָאָף וְאֶעֱדָאָה סִיפֶאֱל וְיִמּוֹת בְּנֵתָה °
 14. וּמִן כֹּאן אֶלְעֶדְרָא יִחְרוּזָה יתואלד בעדוה אֲנָתִי
 15. וִיכֵאֶפִי בֶאֱלִכִיר וִיקְצִי הוּאִיג אֶלְנֵאִם כְּלָהוּם וִיכּוֹן לֹוֹה
 16. זֵ אֲבוּהֵם אֲקוּהוּ מְנָה פִּי בֵּית אֲבוּהֵם וִיכּוֹן מִתְעוֹב וִיכּוֹן
 17. לֹוֹה וְלִדִּיִין אֹו דֵ וְרִדִּי אֶלְאֶמְרָאָן וִיתּוּזֵן מִרְתִּין

- fol. 45 recto.
1. אֲתוּאֲלֵד יִכּוֹן קֵתָאֵל וְאֵן כֹּאן פִּי וְקֵת אֶלּוּזֶהָרָה תוּאֲלֵד
 2. יִכּוֹן צֵאֵלָה וְצֵאֵחֵב אֶסְפֶּאָר • וְאֵן כֹּאן אֶלּוּקֵת אֶלּוּזֵחֵל יִכּוֹן
 3. גִּבְאָר וְצֵאֵחֵב חֲמִיָּה וְלֹא יִכּוֹן גְּנִי °
 4. אֲלִדִּי יתואלד פִּי יוֹם אֶלְאֲחֲנִין יִכּוֹן קֶסְטָאֵל יִסְתַּגְּנִי מֵרָה
 5. וְיִפְתַּקֵּד מֵרָה וְיִשְׁאֲרֵד אֶהֱל בְּלִדּוּהוּ וְלֹא יִבְאֵלִיו בָּהּ
 6. לֵאֲיִנוּהוּ תוּאֲלֵד פִּי יוֹם אֶלְקֶמֶר וְהִדָּא אֶלְעֵלָאִם לִלְשַׁחֵר
 7. מִן רֵאִם אֶלְשַׁחֵר אֵלִי אֶלְנֶצֶף הוּ גִיד לֵאֲיִנוּהוּ גֵא פִּי כְּמֵאֵל
 8. אֶלְקֶמֶר וּמִן אֶלְנֶצֶף אֵלִי אֲכִיר יִכּוֹן אֶרְתַּעֲאֵשׁ פֶּאֶן תוּאֲלֵד
 9. פִּי וְקֵת אֶלְקֶמֶר יִכּוֹן קֶאֱצִי • וְאֵן תוּאֲלֵד פִּי וְקֵת אֶלְשֶׁמֶס
 10. יִכּוֹן מִסְכִּין • וְאֵן כֹּאן פִּי וְקֵת אֶלְכֵאֲתֵב וְאֶלְמִשְׁתָּרִי יִכּוֹן
 11. צֵאֵלָה • וְאֵן כֹּאן פִּי וְקֵת אֶלְאֲחֶמֶר יִכּוֹן צֵאֵחֵב אֶסְפֶּאָר
 12. וְאֵן כֹּאן פִּי וְקֵת אֶלּוּזֶהָרָה יִכּוֹן גְּנִי וְכִיר וְצֵעִיָּף אֶלְבָּרֵן °
 13. אֲלִדִּי יתואלד פִּי יוֹם אֶלֶגֶ יִכּוֹן צִפִּיק אֶלּוּגָה וִיכּוֹן
 14. מִתְעֲטֵם לֵאֲיִנוּהוּ תוּאֲלֵד פִּי יוֹם אֶלְאֲחֶמֶר פֶּאֶן וְקֵת לֶלְאֲחֶמֶר
 15. יִכּוֹן שִׁין • וְאֵן כֹּאן פִּי וְקֵת אֶלּוּזֶהָרָה יִכּוֹן צֵעִיָּף אֶלְבָּרֵן •
 16. וְאֵן כֹּאן פִּי וְקֵת אֶלְכֵאֲתֵב וְאֶלְמִשְׁתָּרִי יִכּוֹן צֵאֵחֵב חֵן •
 17. וְאֵן כֹּאן פִּי וְקֵת וּזְחֵל תוּאֲלֵד יִכּוֹן קֵתָאֵל וִיכּוֹן פִּי אֲכִירוּהוּ חוּזִין

1. ואן כאן פי וקת אלשמס תואלד יכון סלים צחיה *
 fol. 46 recto.
 2. אלדי יתואלד פי יום אלד יכון אנסאן שריף וצאלח וקא[צי]
 3. פאן כאן אלוקת ללכאחב וללמשחרי יכון עאקל וגני *
 4. ואן כאן אלוקת ללזוהרה יכון גבי וכייר ומרצוה באלכלפה *
 5. ואן כאן אלוקת ללאחמר יכון מרה בכייר ומרה בשר *
 6. ואן כאן אלוקת לזוהל יכון חכים ולא יכון גני * ואן כאן אלוקת
 7. ללשמס יכון שריף בלא גנא
 8. אלדי יתואלד פי יום אלה יכון שריף וגני ועאקל פאן
 9. כאן אלוקת ללמשחרי יכון גני ועאקל וכייר * ואן כאן
 10. אלוקת ללכאחב יכון כיים וכייר * ואן כאן אלוקת לאל
 11. אחמר יכון מרה בכיר ומרה בשר * ואן כאן אלוקת לאל
 12. זוהרה יכון כייר וגני ואן כאן אלוקת לזוהל יכון גבאר
 13. וימשי פי אלחק * ואן כאן אלוקת ללקמר יכון קאצי וצאחב
 14. חק * ואן כאן אלוקת ללשמס יכון צאחב בלאם וצאחב
 15. היבה ורועב * אלדי יתואלד פי יום אלגמעה יכון כייר
 16. וגני פאן כאן אלוקת ללזוהרה יכון מתוגע פי בדנוה * ואן
 17. אלוקת ללאחמר יכון כייר וגני * ואן כאן אלוקת ללמשחרי

1. אלכאחב יכון כיים וגני וכייר ומחבוב * ואן כאן אלוקת
 fol. 46 verso.
 2. [ללזוהל יכון גבאר * ואן כאן אלוקת ללקמר יכון קאצי
 3. פי מוצעה * ואן כאן אלוקת ללשמס יכון צליף ורדי
 4. אלדי יתואלד פי יום אלסבת יכון ראיח פי
 5. בדנוה אן כאן אלוקת לזוהל יכון צליף וצאחב חמיה
 6. ואן כאן אלוקת ללזוהרה ישארד אלנאם וירגע ירציהום
 7. ואן כאן אלוקת ללמשחרי יכון צאחב חק ימחבוב
 8. ללנאסי ואן כאן אלוקת ללכאחב פי אלאו . . .
 9. ואן כאן אלוקת ללאחמר יכון קוי . . .
 10. ואן כאן אלוקת ללקמר יכון גבאר וקא[צי] *
 11. חנך לשצם ראשית *
 12. כול מן אוציב לזה אחר הרה אלדרארי פי
 13. בורגוה פאינוה יכון שריף ויוקבל מנוה פאן
 14. כאן אללאחמר חם פי מולדוה פאינוה יעיש כחיר
 15. ויוקחל באלסיף ואן כאן אלשמס ואלאחמר פי
 16. מולדוה יוחרק באלנאר * ואן כאן אלשמס ואלאחמר
 17. פי בית אלאבא פאינוה איצא יוחרק באלנאר

TRANSLATION

(fol. 43 r)

1. pain and he is filled ¹ with fine things ² and sweet speech. He will decide the necessities of
2. all men. He will be ashamed to ask; for if he asks, he will receive no answer.³ He will be a
3. righteous man, hating that which is false, a man of knowledge and understanding that which is secret.
4. He that is born ⁵ in the middle of the month will be short of stature and afraid of
5. everything. He that is born at the end of it will be kept to his bed.⁶
6. He that is born in the sign of *Scorpio* will be acquainted ⁷ with things and will trust anyone
7. who says anything to him, even a murderer or one that is near death.⁸ He will be dark of countenance and brilliant-eyed, broad-shouldered and thin-legged. Now, whoever
9. is born in the middle (of the month) will be intelligent and rich. He who is born at
10. its end will be poor and a murderer. He that is born in the sign of
11. *Sagittarius*, will be a mighty man and unmerciful. Should he belong to the people (in power)⁹

¹ Literally "and they cover him". None of the dictionaries cite the third conjugation of this verb; but the writer may write in this manner either the first or the second conjugation.

² i. e. رفاق, which I am forced to render somewhat freely here.

³ يَرَدَّ = يراد.

⁴ = وَيَبْغُضُ.

⁵ = تَوَالِدَ.

⁶ = صاحب فراش—bed-ridden?

⁷ = يتألف.

⁸ قَرَّاض; but the translation is most doubtful.

⁹ A pure conjecture; all that can be read is the article ل.

12. he will govern a province.¹⁰ He will fear no man.¹¹ He will be thin-legged
13. brilliant-eyed and dark of countenance. He that is born at the (end of it)
14. will be good¹² and will do good to others. He that is born at the
15. beginning of the Sign of *Capricorn* will become rich; his ears¹³ will be large. His death
16. will be by means of a sword or the hangman.¹⁴ He that is born (at the middle¹⁵ of it)

(fol. 43 v)

1. will be rich and fat of body. He that is born at the end of it will be
2. poor and he will be squint-eyed.¹⁶ He that is born at the beginning of *Aquarius*
3. will be tall and long-legged. He will not be clever, but scornful¹⁷
4. he will be, and sickness will repeatedly come upon him¹⁸ in his eyes every year. He that is born
5. at the beginning of *Pisces*, will be a braggart¹⁹ and a thief; there will appear in his eyes

¹⁰ وِلِّيْ.

¹¹ رَجُل.

¹² خَيْرٌ "generous" or "religious"; وَيَكَافِي بِخَيْرٍ.

¹³ أَذْنِيْهِ.

¹⁴ حُنَاق.

¹⁵ This ought to be فِيْ نَصْفِهِ—as the author would put it פִּי נֶצְפֹה; but the remaining letters look like אֶכִּיר, which, however, follows in the next line.

¹⁶ أَحْوَل.

¹⁷ حَمِيَّة.

¹⁸ Reading يَنْيِبُهُ; though the nun looks like a *gimel*.

¹⁹ صُلْف.

6. defects, and a bad ²⁰ smell in his nose. But he that is born at its end
7. will have a long life.
8. Here follows another chapter.
9. He whom *Aries* protects, he will become a tiller of the soil and gain from it.²¹
10. He will have four sisters, and trouble in his left side.²²
11. He will have three children or seven. He will suffer much illness and will marry
12. three wives. He will die a peaceful death,²³ and those that come after him ²⁴ will have ease in obtaining
13. animals.²⁵ The rich will love him; but the poor will hate him.
14. He whom *Taurus* protects, there will be born after him ²⁶ a daughter.²⁷
15. He will be fatigued ²⁸ of body. He will eat much hay ²⁹ as do animals.
16. He will suffer from much illness. He will marry seven wives. He will make money and,
17. at the end, he and his companions will suffer and the people of his house will become poor.

²⁰ ⁵ ⁵ /
سوء.

²¹ Reading uncertain. Text looks like מיוה. I read מנוה. On the margin and coming, as they seem, after יחרזות are the words בערוה יחזאלר.

²² عيب في جنبه الايسر.

²³ Between the words מות and חסן there is the same sign that is found in the heading of this section between the words באב and אכר. What does it signify?

²⁴ His descendants.

²⁵ ماشية pl. of مواشي.

²⁶ After his death.

²⁷ صببة.

²⁸ متعب.

²⁹ A plural of جرزة. جرز means, also, a glutton.

(fol. 44 r)

1. He whom *Gemini*³⁰ protect will have a male child after him.
He will be
2. dark-handed³¹ and clever³² and powerful; but his accomplishments will be small and he will not
3. inherit anything of the wealth of his father. He will have three sisters and three children or five.
4. His sicknesses will be few. He will marry twice. His affairs will become important³³ at
5. the end of his life. His life will be pleasant and he will die a pleasant death.³⁴
6. He whom *Cancer* protects, there will be born after him a daughter.³⁵ He will become
7. rich and wise. He will walk and not become tired. He will beget many daughters.
8. His illnesses will be bad. He will marry many wives. His friends will obey him.
9. His ways will be pleasant, but his enemies will be strong—stronger³⁶ than he, and his death
10. will be a lingering one. He whom *Leo* protects, there will be born after him
11. a male, whom he will kill. He will be eating (and) drinking all the days of his life.
12. He will lead a pleasant life.³⁷ He will not have³⁸ money, and for others he will tire himself. All

³⁰ The text seems to read here דיוקוד; but I am unable to translate this word here.

³¹ The text has מְבִיטָר (so punctuated). I take it as standing for מְסוֹד.

³² Read כִּיֶּס, which word occurs further on.

³³ ويعظم شأنه.

³⁴ See note 23.

³⁵ Under the letter ה are three dots.

³⁶ Reading אָקוּא = אָקוּא; though the first letter is uncertain.

³⁷ Reading ומתנאם; the last letter might also be a *samekh*; i. e. מתנאם "weak".

³⁸ Text has יתרוֹב, with a non-final *kaf*.

13. his friends will be in good estate, his enemies lowly. He will die suddenly.³⁹
14. He whom *Virgo* protects, there will be born after him a daughter.⁴⁰
15. He will reward goodness,⁴¹ will discharge the duties of all men. There will be to him
16. three brothers stronger than himself in his father's house. He will be troubled and there will be
17. to him two children or four. He will suffer from sicknesses and will marry twice.

(One folio is lost here, referring to the other six signs of the Zodiac.)

(fol. 45 r)

1. is born⁴² will be a slayer, and if he is born in the time⁴³ of *Venus*
2. he will be happy and the owner of good things.⁴⁴ But if the time be that of *Saturn* he will be
3. powerful and scornful, but he will not be rich.
4. He that is born on a Monday will be ,⁴⁵ at one time he will be rich
5. at another time he will be wanting. He will frighten the people of his place, but they will pay no attention to him,⁴⁶
6. because he was born on the day of the Full Moon. Now this is the guide-post⁴⁷ for (each) month.
7. From the beginning of the month until its middle one is in good condition,⁴⁸ for one comes (to life) at the fullness

³⁹ *بغتة*.

⁴⁰ Cfr. note 35. Do the three dots differentiate *حب* from *حب*?

⁴¹ *يكافي بالخير*.

⁴² Text *יְהוָה*; but, evidently, = *يتوالد*.

⁴³ i. e. under the auspices.

⁴⁴ *عاسفار*?

⁴⁵ What *קסמא* means, I do not know. From that which follows one would guess that it means "of uncertain state" or the like.

⁴⁶ *بلى*.

⁴⁷ *علام*.

⁴⁸ *جيد*. One would expect *גייך*!

8. of the Moon. From the middle until the end he will tremble(?).
If he is born
9. when the moon is shining⁴⁹ he will become a Cadi. But if
he is born when the sun is shining
10. he will be a poor man. If he is born while Mercury is shining
or Jupiter he will be
11. happy, if when Mars is shining, he will be the owner of good
things; if at the time of Venus, he will
12. be rich and kind-hearted,⁵⁰ but small of body.
13. He that is born on *Tuesday* will be impudent-faced and will be
14. proud because he was born on Mars' day, for the time that is
under Mars
15. is horrible.⁵¹ If he is (born)⁵² in the time of Venus he will
be small of body.
16. If in the time of Mercury and Jupiter, he will be a righteous
man.
17. If he is born in time of Saturn, he will be a fighter and at
the end of his days he will be grieved.

(fol. 46 r)

1. If he is (born) at the time of the Sun he will be secure
(and) in good condition.
2. He that is born on *Wednesday*, will be a man of dignity and
sound and a Cadi.
3. If the season is under Mercury and Jupiter, he will be intelli-
gent and rich.
4. If the season be under Venus, he will be rich and generous,
but his sickness will be diarrhea.⁵³
5. If the season be under Mars, sometimes he will be generous,
sometimes evilly-inclined.
6. If the season be under Saturn, he will be wise, but he will
not be rich; if the season is

⁴⁹ Text has simply "at the time of the moon."

⁵⁰ One would expect *כי יר* !

⁵¹ *فان وقت الاحمر يكون شين*. Does this mean that anything done
under the influence of Mars is so qualified?

⁵² Or "his birth is".

⁵³ *خلفة*.

7. under the Sun, he will be noble but not rich.⁵⁴
8. He that is born on *Thursday* will be noble and rich and intelligent. Now if
9. the season is under Jupiter, he will be noble, rich and kind-hearted; but if
10. the season is under Mercury, he will be clever and rich⁵⁵ and good; if the season is
11. under Mars, at times it will be well with him, at times evil; if the time is under
12. Venus, he will be good and rich; if the time is under Saturn, he will be a powerful man
13. and will walk in the right path. If the season is that of the Moon, he will be a Cadi and a doer
14. of right. If the season is that of the Sun, he will be a man of words,⁵⁶ and a man
15. of ecstasy and fear.⁵⁷ He that is born on *Friday*, will be good
16. and rich. If the season is that of Venus, he will have pains in his body. If
17. the season is that of Mars, he will be good and rich. If the season is that of Jupiter

(fol. 46 v)

1. or⁵⁸ Mercury he will be clever, rich and kind and beloved. If the season
2. be that of Saturn, he will be a powerful man. If the season be that of the Moon, he will be a Cadi,
3. in the place in which he lives.⁵⁹ If the season be that of the sun, he will be a braggart and a bad fellow.
4. He that is born on *Saturday*, he will smell from
5. his body.⁶⁰ If the season be that of Saturn, he will be arrogant and a scornful fellow.

⁵⁴ بَلَا غِنَاء.

⁵⁵ This word may be crossed out in the text.

⁵⁶ Or "of his word".

⁵⁷ رَعْبٌ = رِوْعَب.

⁵⁸ Reading אָן.

⁵⁹ فِي مَوْضِعِهِ.

⁶⁰ رَائِحٌ فِي بَدَنِهِ.

6. If the season be that of Venus he will drive people away, and then return and placate them.
7. If the season be that of Jupiter, he will be righteous and beloved
8. of men. If the season be that of Mercury . . .⁶¹
9. If the season is that of Mars, he will be strong . . .⁶¹
10. If the season is that of the Moon, he will be strong and a Cadi.⁶²
11. Genesis⁶³
12. Anyone who will have placed⁶⁴ one of these shining stars⁶⁵ in
13. his Zodiac sign, will be honored and his favors accepted. If, now,
14. Mars has finished its course at his birth, he will live for a long time,
15. but (finally) will be killed by the sword. If the Sun and Mars are present at the time
16. of his birth, he will be burned in fire. If the Sun and Mars
17. are in the house . . .⁶⁶ he, also, will be burned in fire.

⁶¹ The rest of the line is blotched in the text.

⁶² Reading וקאצי.

⁶³ Before this, and on the same line, are the letters, חנך לשצם, which, evidently, go back to Rashi on *Shabbat* 156a:

ו' מולות הן המשמשין את השעות חנכל שצם

i. e. שבתאי = Sun, נונה Venus, כוכב Mercury, לבנה Moon, שבתאי Saturn, צדק Jupiter, מאדים Mars. Cfr. also, Rashi to *Eruvin* 56a, and see Efros in *JQR.*, XX, p. 128, note 11. The word following is either ראשיתם or ראשית; unless the last circle is merely a sign of punctuation.

⁶⁴ אושב.

⁶⁵ דררי pl. of דררי.

⁶⁶ What בית אלכא means, I do not know. If it has any connection with אב "father", it will make no sense; though in the letter sent by the Rabbis of Southern France to Maimonides, and fortunately published by Marx (*loc. cit.*, § 11), they ask whether the fate of the other members of the family can be learned through astrology. We should then read here בית האבא.

THE BIBLICAL NIMROD AND THE KINGDOM OF EANNA

JOSEPH POPLICHA

ST. CASIMIR'S RECTORY, MAHANOX CITY, PA.

IN THIS ARTICLE I am going to advance a hypothesis concerning the Biblical Nimrod, a man of Cushitic origin who became a Babylonian ruler. It has been suggested that Nimrod is identical with one of the kings of the first dynasty of Uruk, Gilgamesh (commonly) or Lugalbanda (Deimel). We have at present no certain historical reports of that old epoch. We know only the views of the Babylonian historians who left us the lists of Babylonian kings of the oldest times. The lists we have were written about 2000 B. C. Their truthfulness for later periods is generally proved by historic inscriptions from the time of Lugalzaggisi, king of Uruk. As for the older epoch the value of these lists is not yet certain. Besides, there are in the Babylonian literature some historical legends concerning the oldest kings of Uruk, but we have no means of learning their historical values. These conditions cannot encourage anyone to make an inquiry concerning the Biblical Nimrod. My reason for trying it lies in the curious notice that Nimrod was of Cushitic origin. In the Babylonian tradition we find Meskingasher, the founder of the first dynasty of Uruk, bearing some Hamitic (Egyptian) features. Perhaps there is some connection between the Hamite of Uruk and the Cushite Nimrod. It is worth while to compare the Biblical notice of Nimrod with the views of the Babylonian historians concerning the first dynasty of Uruk. The results cannot be quite certain, but they can give some useful hints concerning the Old Babylonian history.

The first book of the Bible says in the tenth chapter, vv. 8-12, as follows:

Cush had begotten Nimrod. He was the first mighty man on earth. He was a mighty hunter before Jahweh; so it is said "as Nimrod, a mighty hunter before Jahweh". His first kingdom was Babel and Erekh and Akkad and Kalneh in the land Shin'ar. From this land he went out to Ashur and built Niniveh and Rehoboth 'ir and Kalah and Resen between Niniveh and Kalah—it is the great city.

There are two different parts in this notice, a proverb concerning Nimrod the great hunter and a series of statements concerning the empire of Nimrod. Chiefly on account of this proverb Nimrod was identified with Gilgamesh or Lugalbanda. The historical statements have not been exploited sufficiently, although they are more accurate and therefore more welcome than the proverb. They are very concise and do not concern Israel, therefore they seem to have been taken from some Babylonian source.

Concerning the Old Babylonian history they suggest:

That Nimrod was son of Cush;
That he was the first mighty man on earth (or in the country);
That in the beginning his empire comprised the cities, Babel,
Erehk, Akkad, Kalneh in Shin'ar.

The Babylonian views concerning the first dynasty of Uruk are given in the texts CBS 13981 and W. B. 444,¹ which relate:

The kingdom of Kish passed to Eanna.
In Eanna Meskingasher, son of the Sungod, as lord and king,
reigned 325 years. Meskingasher went into the sea, went
up on the mountain.
Enmerkar, son of Meskingasher, king of Uruk, who built Uruk,
reigned 420 years.
God Lugalbanda, the shepherd, reigned 1200 years.
God Dumuzi, the fisherman, whose city was HA-A^{ki} reigned
100 years.
God Gilgamesh, whose father was a fool, lord of Kulab, reigned
126 years.
Ur-dNungal, son of Gilgamesh etc.

We have to find out what is the relation between the first five kings of Eanna and the Biblical Nimrod.

Nimrod son of Cush.

The name Cush is used in the Bible to indicate the people settled in Africa, south of Egypt. Closely connected with the African Cush are the people of South Arabia called in the Bible the Sons

¹ CBS 13981, published in A. Poebel, *Historical and Grammatical Texts*, No. 2; W. B. 444, published in Stephen Langdon, *Weld-Blundell Collection*, Vol. 2.

of Cush. It cannot be determined whether we are to consider Nimrod as belonging to Cush itself or to the Sons of Cush, but his home is certainly south of Egypt and Babylonia; he is a Hamite and a foreigner in Babylonia.

Babylonian literature gives us at present no information as to whether the first dynasty of Uruk is of Hamitic or other foreign origin; we find, however, in the tradition concerning Meskingasher, the first king of the dynasty, some Egyptian elements. He is said to have made a posthumous journey through water on a mountain, and his entering the water and emerging on the mountain are expressed in the words used to express the Sunset and the Sunrise. I have shown elsewhere² that he is probably identical with Utanapishtim the deluge-hero and the narrative of his posthumous journey was based on Egyptian ideas of the Sungod traveling in a boat through darkness and light. It resembled the posthumous journey of the dead man well known from the Egyptian religion. This resemblance, striking as it is, cannot yet be a proof of Egyptian influence on Babylonian literature, for it can be credited to some psychological factors which were common to Babylonians as well as to Egyptians. But Meskingasher has yet other Egyptian traits. He is called Son of the Sungod. This is a common title of Egyptian kings from the fifth dynasty; nevertheless in the Babylonian literature it was only given to Meskingasher and his son Enmerkar.³ Moreover, Meskingasher is the highest religious and political ruler (En Lugal) who resides in the temple Eanna. These features resemble the Egyptian idea of royal dignity and we do not find them in other Babylonian rulers.⁴ They are in no connection with the posthumous journey of Meskingasher and there is no trace of them in the story of Utanapishtim. We have then some religious and political ideas, independent of one another, connected with the person of Meskingasher, corresponding with Egyptian beliefs rather than with Babylonian ones. It is as unexpected

² *JAOS* 47, 298 ff.

³ W. B. 162. Stephen Langdon, *Weld-Blundell Collection*, Vol. I.

⁴ The Babylonian tradition about Meskingasher resembles what is written in the Papyrus Westcar about Userkaf, the first king of the fifth Egyptian dynasty, being a son of the Sungod, a king and highpriest of Annu. (Erman, *Maerchen des Papyrus Westcar*, I, 11, 19-20. in: *Mitteil. a. d. orient. Samml. d. k. Museen zu Berlin*, Heft V.). Meskingasher is a Son of the Sungod, a highpriest and king who resides in Eanna.

as the Biblical statement of Nimrod the Babylonian ruler being of Cushitic origin. The Cushites and Egyptians inhabited adjacent territories and belong to the Hamite group of nations. Perhaps we have to combine the Biblical statement about Nimrod with the Babylonian tradition of Meskingasher; it would be obvious then that the first dynasty of Uruk was founded by some Hamitic people imbued with elements of Egyptian civilisation. The possibility of such a conjecture will be discussed later.

Nimrod the first mighty man on earth.

The Biblical words, mighty man on earth, are not clear. They are the only title Nimrod is granted in the Bible as a ruler of some Babylonian cities; they must therefore be connected with his royal dignity, and we can seek their explanation in the oldest Babylonian titles of kings.

In the Babylonian lists of kings the first ruler of each dynasty is expressly called King while the other rulers have no title at all except in the case of the first dynasty of Uruk, for its first king, Meskingasher, bears the title Lord and King, while the second, Enmerkar, has the title of King of Uruk. Perhaps we can find some connection between Meskingasher's unusual title and Nimrod's designation as the first mighty man on earth.

We learn from the inscriptions of Old Babylonian kings that there were two different titles of kings in the oldest times of Sumero-Akkadian history, a simple title King and a compound title Lord and King. The compound title was used in South Babylonia in the cities of Uruk and Ur, the simple title was employed in North Babylonia where Kish was the main royal seat. Kish and Uruk were the most glorious royal cities at the time of Sargon of Akkad, as one of the inscriptions shows.⁵ The high dignity of Kish appears in the inscriptions of Eannatum king of Lagash,⁶ even of Ammiditana of the first Babylonian dynasty,⁷ while the inscriptions of Lugalzaggisi praise the high dignity of Uruk.⁸ The simple title, King, was used without change but for the name of the royal city which was adjoined differently in various dynasties. On the con-

⁵ L. Legrain, *Historical Fragments*, pl. V, 49 ff.

⁶ Thureau-Dangin, *Sumero-Akkadische Königsinschriften*, 24. f, 1; 22. 6, 4.

⁷ L. King, *Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, III, 207, No. 100.

⁸ Thureau-Dangin, *SAK*, 152 ff.

trary the compound title, Lord and King, underwent some changes. Various forms of this title are as follows: ⁹

En	kiengi	lugal	kalam	(king Enshakushanna)
En	ki Unug ^{ki}	lugal	ki Uri ^{ki}	(king Lugalzaggesi)
Lugal	Unug ^{ki}	lugal	kalam	(king Lugalzaggesi)
Lugal	Unug ^{ki}	lugal	Uri ^{ki}	(k. Lugalkigubnidudu, Lugalkisalsi)
En	Unug ^{ki}	lugal	Uri ^{ki}	(king Ur-Engur)
Lugal	kiengi	ki-uri	(kings of the third dyn- asty of Ur).

The last title is the final product of the evolution and it has been used without change by kings of Babylonia and Assyria. It is characterised by unity of dignity, for it contains only the title King, *Lugal*, and the duality of territory, *kiengi ki-uri* meaning Sumer and Akkad, the two different parts of Babylonia. In the older forms of the title there is duality of dignity marked in the names Lord and King, *En Lugal*, which denote the highest religious and political dignity, combined with the names of the South Babylonian cities Uruk and Ur (*Unug^{ki}-Uri^{ki}*), the peculiar title En being connected with the name of Uruk. The Babylonian tradition adorns Meskingasher, the founder of the kingdom of Uruk, with the title *En-Lugal* of Eanna, the temple of the city of Uruk founded subsequently, thus combining duality of dignity with unity of territory. The same tendency appears in the title *En kiengi lugal kalam*, for *kiengi* and *kalam* notably denote the same territory. This title would suit even Meskingasher and could be used before the city of Uruk was founded. It is known from the old inscription of Enshakushanna only and perhaps can be regarded as the oldest form of this kind of title.

The meaning of *En kiengi lugal kalam* is not known. The usual translation of these words, Lord of Sumer king of the land, is not clear. Poebel's explanation of this title, that it comprehends the highest dignity of Nippur and Uruk, is not satisfactory, for neither the title *En* nor "King" was used in connection with Nippur. We have to seek another explanation.

⁹ According to the texts collected in Thureau-Dangin, *SAK*, and A. Poebel, *Historical and Grammatical Texts*, No. 34, and the inscription of Enshakushanna.

The meaning of *En*, Lord or Highpriest, and of *Lugal*, King, is certain. Not so *kiengi* and *kalam*. *Kiengi* has the meanings: land, country (*matu*),¹⁰ city of Nippur,¹¹ land of Sumer,¹² place of offerings for the dead.¹³ In any case it means some territory. On the contrary *kalam* seems not to mean a territory but the people of some territory. This appears from the sign *kalam* which has some connection with *ukù*, and from some texts. A Semitic text of Gilgamesh-epic reads:

the kingdom of the people (*šarrutu ša niši*) destined for thee,
the god Enlil.¹⁴

A Sumerian text uses in a similar sentence the words *nam-lugal kalam* parallel to *šarrutu ša niši*.¹⁵ The same meaning of *kalam* appears in the title of Rimsin, the shepherd of all *kalam* of the territory of Nippur,¹⁶ and in some other texts.¹⁷ The most natural meaning of the title *En kiengi lugal kalam* would be Lord of *kiengi*-territory, king of its people.

The question is now what territory is *kiengi*. In the texts of Lugalzaggisi¹⁸ and Sharganisharri¹⁹ it is identical with Nippur. This is suggested also by the just-cited title of Rimsin. But this meaning of *kiengi* can be of later origin, for the texts from Fara, older than the epoch of Lugalzaggisi and Sharganisharri, relate that Uruk Adab Nippur Shurippak belong to *kiengi* (*En-gi-ki*).²⁰ Besides, the title *En* is never found in connection with Nippur. Since in the texts of Fara *kiengi* means a place of offerings for the dead, it is probable that its primitive meaning was a hallowed territory without regard to its situation or greatness.²¹ It could be used

¹⁰ Georg Reisner, *Sumerisch-Babylonische Hymnen*, 130 (VATh 246), vv. 24-27.

¹¹ L. King, *Seven Tablets of Creation*, Vol. I, 217; v. 5.

¹² The usual meaning.

¹³ Deimel in *Biblica*, 1921, 72.

¹⁴ St. Langdon, *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, Pl. 63 ff., Rev. col. III, vv. 32 f.

¹⁵ St. Langdon, *Sumerian Liturgical Texts*, No. 11, rev. 4.

¹⁶ Thureau-Dangin, *SAK*, 216a, 218c.

¹⁷ Thureau-Dangin, *SAK*, 74; 9, 30: 214d.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 154.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 164d; 216a; 218c.

²⁰ Deimel in *Biblica*, 1921, 72.

²¹ We may venture the explanation of *En-gi-ki* as a place (KI) hallowed

to indicate any sacred city or country. In the title *En kiengi* it should mean the territory that was under the power of *En* or simply the country. The old title of the kings of South Babylonia would be then: Lord of the country, king of the people. This would be the developed form of the title Meskingasher is granted in the lists of kings.

Nimrod is called *gibbor ba'areš*, the (first) mighty man on earth (or, in the country). There is a slight resemblance between *gibbor ba'areš* and *en kiengi*, for *kiengi* and the Hebrew *'ereš* can have the same meaning, while *gibbor* seems to be quite different from the Sumerian *en* although there is some idea of power in *en*.²² However, some connection between *gibbor ba'areš* and *en kiengi* is possible. The Old Babylonian rulers used to appropriate the titles of former kings, translating them, if necessary, from the Sumerian to the Semitic language²³ or *vice versa*.²⁴ Lugalzaggisi, king of Uruk, was the last great king who used the title *En-Lugal* frequently. His conqueror Sargon, the founder of the dynasty of Akkad, used this title at least partially. In his Semitic inscriptions²⁵ after the titles King of Akkad, King of Kish, we find the title *Lugal kalam* sometimes preceded by the words Priest of Anu. His successors Rimush and Manishtusu do not call themselves either king of Akkad or *lugal kalam* but simply King of Kish. Naram-Sin introduces a new double-title, The mighty man, King of the four quarters of the world. Its origin is unknown, but since we have seen the founder of Akkad using the titles of North and South Babylonia we may suppose that his successors went the same way. Some of them used the Northern title King of Kish, Naram-Sin could make use of the Southern title *En, Lugal kalam*. This Sumerian title had to be rendered into Semitic, and so it could have been the prototype of The mighty man, King of the four quarters of the world (*Dannum šar kibratim arbaim*). The word *Dannum* (the mighty man) which always occupies the first place, should correspond with *En* and the subsequent *Šar kibratim arbaim*

by some influence (GI) of the lord (EN). It would mean then dominion or empire.

²² According to Dyneley Prince, *Sumerian Lexicon*.

²³ *lugal kiengi kiuri* = *šar šumerim u akkadim*.

²⁴ *šar ki-iš-ra-tim ar-ba-im* = *lugal an-ub-da tab-tab-ba*.

²⁵ A. Poebel, *Historical and Grammatical Texts*, No. 34.

(the king of the four quarters of the world) with *Lugal kalam*. The Old Sumerian title disappears and even the South Babylonian kings of the third dynasty of Ur use the titles of Naram-Sin translated into Sumerian *nitah kal-ga lugal an-ub-da tab-tab-ba*, but this is no proof against the possible connection of this title with *En-Lugal*.

Since the Babylonian *dannum* is identical with the Hebrew *gibbor*, Nimrod's title *gibbor ba'ares* can correspond in this way with *En kiengi*: the statement of his being the first *En kiengi* would agree with the Babylonian tradition of Meskingasher being the first who bore this title. This conjecture cannot prove the connection of Nimrod with the first dynasty of Uruk, but may serve to enlighten it when proved by other data.

Nimrod's kingdom in Babylonia.

The four names, Babel, Erekh, Akkad, Kalneh, representing the four cities belonging to the primitive kingdom of Nimrod, have been identified with the Babylonian cities, Babili, Uruk, Akkad, Kullab.²⁶ Only two of them, viz., Uruk and Kullab, appear in the oldest period of Sumero-Akkadian history, Babili and Akkad not being mentioned until in the epoch of dynasty of Akkad. The name of Akkad, the city founded by Sargon, obliges us to put the Biblical Nimrod in a very late period of Sumero-Akkadian history, and as the Bible itself exposes Nimrod as a man of an ancient past, the names Babel and Akkad are incoherent with the Biblical view.

It is neither a geographical or a historical point of view nor a religious or political motive that placed the four Babylonian cities in this order, which cannot be explained by any inscription of the known later dynasties of Akkad, Ur, Isin. The inscriptions of the dynasty of Akkad mention the cities Akkad and Kish, those of the dynasty of Ur the city Ur, those of Isin the cities Nippur, Ur, Eridu, Uruk. The only text containing four names parallel to the four Biblical names of cities is the list of kings of the first dynasty of Uruk. These names are:

²⁶ The identity of Kalneh with KUL-UNUKI = Kullab, is suggested by Delitzsch and Jensen. It is more probable than the identification of Kalneh with Nippur promoted by Hilprecht and Hommel. The notice of Nimrod, if of any value, must have been taken from Babylonian sources, and in Babylonian inscriptions Nippur takes the first place, not the last one.

in the Babylonian text, Eanna, Uruk, HA-A^{ki}, Kullab;
in the Bible, Babel, Erekh, Akkad, Kalneh.

Both these series have the second and the fourth part identical. Moreover, the first Biblical name, Babel, can be related to Eanna because of similar meaning and writing. *Bab-ili* means Gate of God, *Eanna* means House of Heaven. Both meanings are used promiscuously in the Bible.²⁷ The name of the city Babel can be written *Shu-anna* even without the affirmative *ki*.²⁸ Its difference from *E-anna* is not remarkable. Besides, Eanna is not a name of a city and it was quite easy for a foreign author to confound it with the city of Babel.

The third pair of names, HA-A^{ki} and Akkad cannot yet be explained, because the city HA-A^{ki} is almost unknown. As the city of Akkad founded by Sargon seems to be incompatible with the Biblical view about Nimrod, there is a possibility of some relationship between these names.

We see then that the four names mentioned in the Bible as Nimrod's cities do not yet prove his connection with the first dynasty of Uruk, but the list of rulers of this dynasty is the only known text that can explain the Biblical statement about the cities of Nimrod.

The meaning of the Biblical notice of Nimrod.

We have seen that the three Biblical statements concerning Nimrod can be applied to what we know about the first dynasty of Uruk. Nimrod himself, according to the ingenious suggestion of P. Jensen, is identical with the great Babylonian and Assyrian god NIN-IB commonly read Nimurta.²⁹ This god is identical

²⁷ The house of god—the gate of the heaven, Gen. 28, 17-19.

²⁸ 1 R 49, col. 1-2.

²⁹ Nimrod is a great Assyrian god according to the Bible (Micah 5, 5). So is NIN-IB. The sign IB in this name was pronounced Urta (Ungnad, *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, 1917, 1 ff.). The whole name was pronounced like Namirtu (Hans Ehelolf, *Ein Wortfolgeprinzip im Assyrisch-Babylonischen*, p. 33. Leipzig 1919). The reading god Nimurta is now generally accepted, therefore it will be used in this article. Professor Barton reads the name 𒀭NIN-IB = Nin-Urash, which may be quite correct, but this name is not used in this article lest there be confusion of the female deity NIN-IB of the family of Anu, whose name is doubtlessly Nin-Urash, with the male god NIN-IB of the family of Enlil.

with god Lugalbanda (or Lugalmarada), the third king of the first dynasty of Uruk; ³⁰ it seems then quite possible that it is Lugalbanda whose deeds the Biblical writer relates when speaking of Nimrod. However, the author mentions the Assyrian city Kalhu as a city of Nimrod; since it was first founded in the second millennium B. C., we cannot connect it with the king Lugalbanda but with the god NIN-IB himself. Then the Biblical notice of Nimrod seems to indicate that the Assyro-Babylonian god Nimurta (NIN-IB) was of Cushitic origin and that he was closely connected with the kingdom of Uruk which was founded by Cushites. These statements sound improbable, but perhaps it is worth while to inquire if they can be true. We will try the Cushitic origin of the kingdom of Uruk first.

The Cushitic origin of the kingdom of Uruk.

We have found in the Babylonian tradition concerning the first dynasty of Uruk some Egyptian elements not noted either in the antecedent or in subsequent dynasties. They are connected with Meskingasher, the founder of the dynasty.³¹

The civilizations of Egypt and Babylonia have some common features, but there is no evidence of their intimate relation in historic times. As for the prehistoric epoch, according to Flinders Petrie, predynastic Egypt was influenced at one time by the Elamites and by the Nubians. Both these groups influenced Egyptian civilization independently, or the Elamites may have entered the Nile Valley from the Red Sea up in Nubia and have brought down the Nubian type with them, but this, according to Flinders Petrie, is less likely.³²

On the other side H. Frankfort has proved that some people imbued with South Mesopotamian (Sumerian) culture arrived in Egypt and that the type of boat they used influenced Egyptian art as far back as the end of the predynastic period.³³

³⁰ *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, 1921, 123 ff. Since in the same list appears the name Shulgi (Dungi) a king of the last dynasty of Ur, we have no reason to doubt that the god Lugalbanda is identical with the third king of the first dynasty of Uruk.

³¹ See above, p. 305.

³² W. M. Flinders Petrie, *Prehistoric Egypt*, London 1920, p. 49.

³³ H. Frankfort, *Studies in Early Pottery of the Near East*, I, p. 138-141 (London, 1924).

Since no intimate relation between Egypt and South Mesopotamia is probable we are obliged to conclude that some maritime folk traveling in peculiar boats arrived in Egypt as well as in South Mesopotamia and influenced them both.³⁴ We do not know any thing more about that people, but it would be no mistake to call them Cushites, for the lands of the Cushites (East Africa, South Arabia) were certainly under the influence of those seamen.

The influence of this people on South Mesopotamia can be traced most distinctly in the tradition of Uruk concerning the oldest rulers of this city; consequently the Biblical report of the Cushites having founded the kingdom of Uruk seems to have been taken from some truthful Babylonian historical tradition. This result will help us in considering the other, more hazardous, statement that the god Nimurta (NIN-IB) is of Cushitic origin.

Cushitic origin of the god Nimurta (NIN-IB).

The connecting link between the god Nimurta and the first dynasty of Uruk is Lugalbanda, the third king of the dynasty. He has no peculiar position in the lists of kings except his title of god and his long rule. His extraordinary dignity appears in the myth of god Zu and god Lugalbanda,³⁵ the contents of which are:

God Zu, the divine bird, has stolen the tablets of fates from Enlil the supreme god. God Lugalbanda restores them to Enlil and so merits the divine worship in Ekur, the temple of Enlil in Nippur.

This myth was proclaimed to be of the same character as the myths relating to a god who combats an enemy, conquers him, and so receives the highest honors. However, in this myth there is no warfare and Lugalbanda does not become the supreme god for restoring the tablets of fates to Enlil. We are rather compelled to suppose that it is a historical legend of Lugalbanda, and we can see here a report of some religious alteration in Babylonia. Possibly Enlil, the supreme god, has lost his power and Lugalbanda restored it to him, receiving as a reward the high dignity in the Pantheon of Nippur and the worship in Ekur. On this supposition is based

³⁴ The Egyptian idea of the Sungod traveling in a boat which we have found in the myth of Uruk would suit a maritime people.

³⁵ CT XV, 39 ff.

our inquiry concerning the Cushitic origin of the god Nimurta. We shall proceed the following way: we shall combine the Biblical notice of Nimrod with the Babylonian tradition concerning the first dynasty of Uruk and construct a hypothesis concerning the name and person of god NIN-IB, then we shall inquire whether Babylonian texts favor this hypothesis or not. Our hypothesis is as follows:

Some foreign (Cushitic) tribe invaded South Babylonia, subdued it, and inaugurated a new dynasty, the first of Uruk (Eanna). The political change was followed by a religious one. The old god Enlil of Nippur lost his supreme position, Eanna being now the religious centre of the kingdom. These conditions were intolerable for the priests of Nippur, who regarded them as an injury to Enlil, their God. The new dynasty, that had caused this situation, was not esteemed in Nippur. In the time of Lugalbanda, the third king of the dynasty, the conditions were changed in favor of Enlil. The king performed a religious alteration that gave back the supreme power to Enlil of Nippur. It was made in a peaceful manner and brought to Lugalbanda the highest praises in Nippur where he was acknowledged a god. The myth of the god Zu stealing the tablets of fates had to eternalize these facts. God Zu is a representative of the foreign element, hostile to Enlil, that had invaded Babylonia.

This would explain the overwhelming importance of Lugalbanda in this period of Old Babylonian history, but it remains unexplained why he became a god in Nippur. The idea of a man who became a god does not agree with the usual Babylonian ideas, but it is quite agreeable to Egyptian ones. The Egyptian kings of early dynasties had the name and dignity of the god Horus, and the hawk of this god was the emblem of their royalty.³⁶ Since the invaders who founded the kingdom of Uruk bore some Egyptian features, we can also attribute to them this custom of the old Egyptian kings. We suppose then that the first rulers of Uruk bore the dignity and name of the god Horus and used the divine bird of this god as emblem of their royalty. The priests of Nippur did not acknowledge the divine dignity of the invaders, the enemies of Enlil. The

³⁶ J. Breasted, *History of Egypt*, 40 f., 112.

divine bird, the emblem of their royalty, was regarded in Nippur as the symbol of evil, and might be a prototype of the evil god Zu stealing the tablets of fates. The reformation performed by Lugalbanda ended the humiliation of Enlil of Nippur and reconciled the priests of Nippur with the invaders. The divine dignity of the king was acknowledged, but it was certainly difficult to put a human person into the Pantheon of Nippur. Fortunately, Lugalbanda, like his ancestors, had the name and the character of Horus, a real god. This god was now accepted in Nippur and as a real god, although identical with the man Lugalbanda, and was granted a high position in the Pantheon. His name developed into NIN-IB or Nimurta.

We have now to compare this hypothesis with Babylonian texts. That the kings of Uruk bore the title of the god Horus is favored by the text *VATh*, 7025. This text concerns the deification of the king Lipit-Ishtar of the dynasty of Isin.³⁷ The chief actor in the deification of the king is the god Anu, who confers the divine dignity on the king, grants to him lordship and kingship (*nam-en nam-lugal*) and finally proclaims him distinctly the god Urash (IB). The god Enlil is active in another part of the text, he also bestows benefits on the king, who is named his son and finally appears to be god IB and god NIN-IB (Urash and Nimurta). The title *En-Lugal* is connected closely with Uruk, Anu is the god of Uruk, the god Urash (IB) belongs to the family of Anu; we have then to suppose that these ceremonial actions had their origin in Uruk and that the kings of this city were deified and called god Urash (IB). This name resembles *Hr*, the Egyptian name of Horus, but remotely. However, there is in the Babylonian Pantheon a god Uru. He is identical with the god Urash³⁸ and has a peculiar connection with the god Nimurta like the god Urash.³⁹

³⁷ Heinrich Zimmern, "Sumerische Kultlieder aus altbabylonischer Zeit", No. 199, in: *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der kön. sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, Phil. hist. Kl., 1916, 68, Heft 5.

³⁸ 𒌦Uru = 𒌦NIN-IB ša alli (*CT* 25, 11, 26).

𒌦Urash = 𒌦NIN-IB ša alli (*CT* 24, 40, 661).

³⁹ 𒌦IB = 𒌦NIN-IB = god Nimurta (commonly).

𒌦Uru = 𒌦NIN-Uru = god Nimurta (*CT* 25, 12, 20; 25, 13, 30; 24, 7, 10 ff).

It is remarkable that 𒌦NIN-Uru is a name of Nimurta and of his goddess-consort (*CT* 25, 12, 20; 24, 7, 14).

Since the sign IB is read in a different way in the names of the gods IB and NIN-IB as Urash and Urta, we may suppose that the name of the god IB was pronounced in some different way and perhaps the name Uru can be related to Urash and Urta. This would bring the god IB more closely to the Egyptian *Hr* or Horus. Finally, it may be noted that according to our hypothesis the kingdom of Uruk is of Cushitic origin and the elements it has in common with some Egyptian dynasties are properly Cushitic, consequently some difference between the Egyptian and the Babylonian name of some Cushitic deity is admissible.

That the kings Lugalbanda and Gilgamesh were friendly toward Nippur we learn from the myth of Zu and from the history of the Tum-mal of the goddess Ninlil.⁴⁰ That on the contrary Meskingasher was hostile toward Nippur seems to follow from his character as the religious ruler in Eanna, the temple of Uruk. Meskingasher and Enmerkar are distinguished by the title Sons of the Sungod⁴¹ which their successors do not use, being called gods instead. Some difference between Enmerkar and the subsequent kings is noted in the tale of Gilgamesh in Aeliani *De natura animalium* XII, 21, where that king is pictured as the grand-father and also as the enemy of Gilgamesh, whom he desires to kill. However, these hints cannot be regarded as great support for our hypothesis.

The connection of the god Nimurta with the god Horus depends on the relationship of the god Urash with Horus. The god Urash is identical with the god Nimurta. According to the lists of gods Urash (¹¹IB) belongs to the family of Anu⁴² and to the circle of Nimurta.⁴³ In either group he has a different goddess-consort; in the family of Anu her name is ¹¹NIN-IB, in the group of Nimurta her name is ¹¹NIN-Urû.

God Nimurta himself belongs to the family of Enlil, his name is written ¹¹NIN-IB, his goddess-consort is ¹¹NIN-Nippur (lady of Nippur). Then the name ¹¹NIN-IB appears in the lists of gods as a female name of goddess-consort of ¹¹IB and as the name of the

⁴⁰ A. Poebel, *Historical and Grammatical Texts*, No. 6.

⁴¹ See above, p. 305.

⁴² *CT* 24, Pl. I.

⁴³ Heinrich Zimmern, in *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der kön. sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, Phil.-hist. Kl., 1911, 119.

male god Nimurta. The female name and character of the goddess NIN-IB, who belongs to the family of Anu, are clear; the male character of Nimurta in spite of his female name ¹¹NIN-IB belonging to the family of Enlil is not clear. This shows that the god Nimurta (NIN-IB) is a product of some changes performed on the name and character of the god Urash (IB). The name of his goddess-consort Lady of Nippur shows his connection with that city, and his connection with the god IB shows that his origin was in the city of Anu, Uruk.

That the hawk of Horus as emblem of the kingdom of Uruk could have been the prototype of Zu stealing the tablets of fates from Enlil seems to be favored by the texts of Lagash. God Zu (^dIm-gig^{hu}) is depicted there as a symbol of might and emblem of the city Lagash and god Ningirsu,⁴⁴ with whom he is closely connected. The god Ningirsu is identical with the god Nimurta; his connection then with the god Urash is quite possible; thus he becomes related to the god Horus and his divine bird to the hawk of Horus.

We may conclude that our hypothesis concerning the origin of the god Nimurta does not appear impossible when compared with Babylonian texts.

The result of our inquiry is that the Biblical narration of Nimrod is a valuable historical notice. It can be combined with Babylonian tradition concerning the first dynasty of Uruk and so contribute to our knowledge of this epoch of Babylonian history. It seems to be based on some truthful Babylonian tradition, but as the historical value of Babylonian texts concerning this epoch is not known, our hypothesis based on them remains doubtful.

⁴⁴ Thureau-Dangin, *SAK* 178i; 44e, 92 ff., 112 ff.

THE SYNAGOGUE OF THE HERODIANS

HARRY J. LEON

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

AMONG the inscriptions of the Jewish catacomb in Vigna Randanini on the Appian Way in Rome, Father R. Garrucci found, less than seventy years ago, a fragment which reads as follows: ¹

ΓΩΓΗΞ
ΙΡΟΔΙΩΝ
ΕΥΛΟΓΙΑ ΠΑΣΙ

Scholars were quick to recognize in the first line the remnant of the word *συναγωγῆς*. The second line was less obvious, for although the names of several synagogues of Rome had been revealed by the inscriptions,² there was none similar to this. Garrucci himself interpreted it as referring to a synagogue of the Rhodians, presumably a community of Jews who came originally from the island of Rhodes. Emil Schürer³ accepted the reference to a synagogue of the Rhodians, but threw out the suggestion that ΙΡΟΔΙΩΝ might be for *Ἡροδίων*. Since ι was sometimes written for η in these inscriptions,⁴ this might be a reference to a synagogue of the Herodians, apparently so named in honor of King Herod. Abraham Berliner, author of a history of the Jews in Rome,⁵ while including the synagogue of the Rhodians in his list of synagogues, repeated Schürer's suggestion of a synagogue of the Herodians. O. Marucchi's guide to the Via Appia catacomb⁶ and R. Lanciani's

¹ *Dissertazioni archeologiche di vario argomento* (Rome, 1865), p. 185, no. 37.

² A convenient list is given by G. La Piana in *Harvard Theological Review*. XX (1927), p. 352.

³ *Gemeindeverfassung der Juden in Rom in der Kaiserzeit* (Leipzig, 1879), p. 17, and inscription no. 36 in appendix.

⁴ See *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, LVIII (1927), 215.

⁵ *Geschichte der Juden in Rom*, I, 66.

⁶ *Breve guida del cimitero giudaico in Vigna Randanini* (Rome, 1884), p. 25, no. 106.

account of the Jewish community in *New Tales of Old Rome*⁷ both refer to the synagogue of the Rhodians.

The matter became distinctly controversial when Vogelstein and Rieger in their *History of the Jews in Rome*⁸ emphatically discarded Schürer's conjecture of a synagogue of the Herodians, since it was most unlikely that the Jews of Rome should have named a congregation after one of the hated Idumaeans. On the other hand, it was not surprising that the Jews of Rhodes had a community in Rome, since during the early empire Rhodes had an active commerce with Rome, and Jews had since early times lived on the Ionian islands. Still, with the uncertainty of the reading, those authors prudently hesitated to make further conclusions.⁹

Nikolaus Müller, the most prominent explorer of the Jewish catacombs, who unhappily died in 1912 before he could complete his study, reverted to the synagogue of the Herodians, and using the name of this synagogue as a parallel, argued that the synagogue of the Agrippesians, which was usually understood as having been named for Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa, was actually named for the Jewish King Agrippa I or II.¹⁰

With the more recent writers the synagogue of the Herodians appears to be especially favored. Thus Juster insists on reading Ἡροδίων and not Ἰποδίων.¹¹ So does S. Krauss, with the reminder that Rhodians and Herodians are confused also in the Mishnah.¹² Very recently Professor George La Piana in his article on "Foreign Groups at Rome,"¹³ accepted the reading Ἰποδίων and stated that this synagogue of the Herodians was probably dedicated to Herod. Similarly, H. Leclercq, in his elaborate article on Judaism in Cabrol and Leclercq's *Dictionary of Christian Archaeology*,¹⁴ in-

⁷ P. 244.

⁸ H. Vogelstein and P. Rieger, *Geschichte der Juden in Rom*, I, 39 f.

⁹ The synagogue of the Rhodians is accepted without question by R. L. Benas in a paper on "Records of the Jews in Rome and their Inscriptions from Ancient Catacombs" in *Proceedings of the Literary and Philosophical Society of Liverpool*, L (1896), p. 83.

¹⁰ N. Müller and N. A. Bees, *Inschriften der jüdischen Katakomben am Monteverde zu Rom* (Leipzig, 1919), p. 6. Cf. Müller, *Die jüdische Katakomben am Monteverde* (Leipzig, 1912), p. 108.

¹¹ *Les juifs dans l'empire romain* (Paris, 1914), I, p. 415.

¹² *Synagogale Altertümer* (Berlin, 1922), p. 254 f.

¹³ In *Harvard Theological Review*, XX (1927), pp. 352 and 356, n. 25.

¹⁴ *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, VII (1928), col. 133.

cludes the synagogue of the Herodians in his list of Synagogues at Rome.¹⁵

A closer examination of the inscription on which this discussion is based has convinced me that a different interpretation is not only possible but necessary. Our fragment, which is still in the catacomb, is the right-hand portion of what must have been a slab of considerable size. The dimensions of the extant portion are height 45.5 cm., width 60 cm. The deeply-cut ornamental letters are 6.4 cm. in height, a size which, I believe, is not equaled in the other inscriptions of the catacomb of Via Appia. Since by far the greater part of the stone is missing, many letters must have intervened between ΓΩΓΗΞ and ΙΡΟΔΙΟΝ. Now in all the other Jewish inscriptions from Rome the name of the synagogue, if given, either directly follows the word *συναγωγή* or is separated from it only by the definite article, as *συναγωγῆς τῶν Αἰγυπτιασίων*.¹⁶ Hence in the present inscription the name of the synagogue has been lost altogether, and the remnant of the second line must be otherwise interpreted.

That, fortunately, is not difficult, since the inscription easily fits into the familiar form of dative of the deceased, nominative of the surviving relative, and possibly a verb. Here the deceased was clearly an official of a synagogue, since the name of the synagogue is mentioned only in the case of officials. The Ι in line two is the last letter of a dative, probably of the third declension.¹⁷ Then Ῥοδίον must be the name of the man who set up the inscription, possibly a son of the deceased. The name Ῥοδίον is cited in Pape's *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen*. That the Jews of Rome used Greek and Roman names far more than names of Semitic origin I have demonstrated elsewhere.¹⁸ That the name Rhodion is otherwise unexampled in the Jewish inscriptions of Rome can be no argument against accepting it, since most of the known names of the Jews of ancient Rome occur in single examples only.

¹⁵ G. Blustein in his popular *Storia degli Ebrei in Roma* (Rome, 1921, p. 29) mentions both interpretations as possible.

¹⁶ *C. I. G.* 9903.

¹⁷ It should be observed that it cannot be of the first or second declension, for in the Judaeo-Roman inscriptions the ι of the dative singular of these declensions is never written.

¹⁸ *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, LIX (1928), p. 215.

The inscription may, therefore, be conjecturally restored as follows, the inserted names being, of course, merely examples:

ΙΟΥΣΤΩ ΑΡΧΟΝΤΙ ΣΥΝΑΓΩΓΗΣ
ΤΩΝ ΚΑΜΠΗΣΙΩΝ ΠΑΤΡΙ ΡΟΔΙΩΝ
ΥΙΟΣ ΚΑΛΩΣ ΕΠΟΙΗΣΕΝ ΕΥΛΟΓΙΑ ΠΑΣΙ

Ἰουστῶ ἄρχοντι συναγωγῆς τῶν Καμψησίων πατρὶ Ῥοδίων υἱὸς καλῶς
ἐποίησεν. Εὐλογία πᾶσι.

or

ΤΩ ΑΡΧΟΝΤΙ ΣΥΝΑΓΩΓΗΣ
ΚΑΜΠΗΣΙΩΝ ΜΑΡΩΝΙ ΡΟΔΙΩΝ
ΥΙΟΣ ΕΠΟΙΗΣΕΝ ΕΥΛΟΓΙΑ ΠΑΣΙ

Τῷ ἄρχοντι συναγωγῆς Καμψησίων Μαρωνι Ῥοδίων υἱὸς ἐποίησεν. Εὐλογία
πᾶσι.

I have suggested the synagogue of the Campesians (i. e., of the Campus Martius) since that synagogue only is certainly attested in the inscriptions of this catacomb. A parallel to this form from the same catacomb would be, e. g., τῇ ἰδίᾳ [μη]μητρὶ Ἰουλαί Καστρίκις υἱὸς ἐποίησεν.¹⁹

Other possible restorations can easily be suggested, but whatever the exact restoration it remains reasonably certain that Ῥοδίων is the name of an individual and that the synagogue of the Herodians or the Rhodians must be expunged from the roll of synagogues at Rome.

¹⁹ Garrucci, *Cimitero degli antichi Ebrei*, p. 45. Cf. also *ibid.*, p. 58, and the same writer's *Dissertazioni archeologiche*, II, p. 158, nos. 4, 5.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Ur Excavations, Texts. I: Royal Inscriptions. By C. J. GADD and LEON LEGRAIN; with contributions by SIDNEY SMITH and E. R. BURROWS. Publications of the Joint Expedition of the British Museum and the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia: THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA PRESS, 1929. 4 to; pp. xxiv + 100, and pls. A-W + lix.

The Ur excavations are perhaps best known for the truly magnificent finds which have been made in the royal graves of that ancient city. But together with such splendid objects as the golden helmet of *Mes. Kalam. Shar* or the headdress of *Shub. Ad*, inscrip-tional material as well has been coming up steadily. The present publication contains 309 of these texts with transliterations, trans-lations, and frequent notes. The documents cover the remarkably long period of practically two millennia and a half; the oldest of them (268) belongs to the wife of Mesannipadda, the founder of the First Dynasty of Ur and the latest (264) brings us down to the time of Cambyases. There is also a great variety of inscribed objects from which the texts have been copied: statues, bowls, cups, seals, clay cones, mace-heads, bricks and the like. It goes without saying that the contents offer an equally rich selection. Of the more important inscriptions may be mentioned 111, which refers to an otherwise unknown rebellion at Ur of a certain Na'id-Shamash against Nur-Adad of Larsa, and 274-276, which are dated in the time of the Dynasty of Agade and contain important geographical information; the latter texts are, unfortunately, very poorly written and the editor deserves much credit for undertaking the ungrateful task of copying and interpreting these documents. Texts no. 30 ff. should also be noted, since they prove conclusively that *Ur-Nammu*, the founder of the Third Dynasty of Ur, was originally the vassal of *Utu-Khegal* of Erech.

It is only natural that a publication containing so many diver-sified texts should give rise to a few queries. Thus e. g., the name *Barakhsu* (p. 4) can scarcely represent the correct form of the

place-name. The proper ending is either *s(h)i* or *s(h)e*, cf. *AJSL* 45. 232. In fact, the final syllable is probably an indication of the nominative ending as may be seen by comparing the name of the city *Paḥarraše*, which varies with *Paḥarra* and *Paḥarriwa* (gen./loc. case), cf. *JAOS* 49. 272. Incidentally, the two cities may even be identical; the forms *Paraḥši* and *Paḥarraše* are sufficiently close for that.

Sumerian *Engar* is "cultivator" rather than "irrigator" (text no. 106.4); the Accadian equivalent *irrišu* is distinctly in favor of the former translation, and the passage in Lugalzaggissi, vase-inscription 2.19, ("with waters of gladness") which is cited in support of the authors' translation, has no direct bearing on the matter. But these are obviously very unimportant details. We cannot but feel grateful that the rather unwieldy material has been presented to us so promptly, with reliable translations and with very welcome comments and annotations.

I cannot conclude, however, without a mild protest. In their transcriptions the editors have done away entirely with diacritical marks, leaving the homophones without any distinguishing signs. It is quite true that the appended texts make it easy for the reader to determine in each case the sign in question. But trouble is sure to arise when the texts come to be cited by scholars, as they are bound to be; what shall then prevent each student from using his own favorite system of transcription? The result will be that the same passage will appear in future quotations under several disguises, making confusion worse confounded, instead of eliminating it as the editors seem to expect. The system of Thureau-Dangin is now almost universally adopted, and it is sincerely hoped that the new series of texts, which has made such an auspicious start with the present publication, will follow it in its future volumes. No system of this sort can be completely free from faults; at the same time, unless we all agree on one, there will never be an end to the chaotic conditions now prevailing.

Manuel d'archéologie orientale. By G. CONTENAU. Paris: A. PICARD, 1927. Vol. I: Notions générales; Histoire de l'art. Pp. 545, with 357 illustrations.

The most recent work of the learned and industrious conservateur

of the Louvre is bound to furnish a valuable addition to the library of every Orientalist. The constantly increasing scope of exploration in the Near East often makes it difficult to keep up with the latest discoveries and to assimilate them into a comprehensive picture of life and arts in ancient Hither Asia. This desideratum Contenau has set out to supply, and judging from the volume before us, the introductory one of a series, the whole work will constitute a lucid and reliable introduction to the numerous problems of Oriental archaeology.

The main part of the first volume is devoted to a discussion of the geographical and ethnic background of the remains that are to be studied in the forthcoming installments. A brief account of the languages and of the religious beliefs of the peoples in question is also included, and the book closes with a chapter on the archaic art of Sumer and Elam, with special emphasis on the much-discussed painted pottery of the aeneolithic age.

As the book is intended for the general student rather than for the specialist, Contenau avoids going into details, confining himself to a presentation of the leading theories on the more debatable subjects, such as the origin of the Sumerians, the home of the Semites, the relations of Susa I to Susa II, etc. The author's own view is, however, discreetly indicated at the same time, so that the book is not devoid of freshness and originality in spite of its general character. To be sure, one cannot always accept M. Contenau's theories without reservations. That the Sumerians preceded the Semites in Mesopotamia (pp. 87, 124 ff.) is far from certain; in fact, a very good case can be made out for the opposite view.¹ One feels also that the author's revival of the theory of Clay, advocating the Amorite origin of the Semites, should have been supported by arguments more cogent than the mere statement that Arabia is too poor and barren to have been the original home of the Semites (p. 124). H. Frankfort² has recently traced an important cultural center to Northern Syria, where the 'Semites' are said to have had a leading part. A correlation of the opinions of Contenau with the material presented by Frankfort would yield an imposing body of evidence, provided that Frankfort's premises are right. However, in the opinion of the present reviewer, the

¹ Cf. *Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, IX (1929) 17 ff.

² *Studies in Early Pottery of the Near East*, II (1927).

North Syrian factor is Hurrian rather than Semitic and, unless more convincing proof is unearthed, the Amorites will have to be satisfied with the less ambitious rôle of a secondary focus of Semitic expansion.

The perplexing question of the origin of the Sumerians is solved by Contenau with the Central Asiatic hypothesis; it is in Central Asia, the author believes, that the cultures of Elam, Armenia, Asia Minor, and Sumer, had their ultimate origin. This view has much in its favor, but is liable to misconstruction, as it is now expressed (p. 122). For it must not be overlooked that the civilizations of Sumer on the one hand, and of the Highland Zone on the other, show very considerable points of difference when they first emerge into the light of history.

Die Ostkanaanäer. By THEO BAUER. Leipzig: ASIA MAJOR, 1926. 4 to; pp. viii + 94.

This book, which is described in the subtitle as "a philological-historical investigation concerning the wandering group of the so-called 'Amorites' in Babylonia," is an unusually challenging piece of work. In the first part of the monograph all the relevant proper names are tabulated and analyzed. This is followed by a comprehensive grammatical sketch of the linguistic material as deduced from the names in question. Both the people and the language under consideration are termed, after Landsberger, "East-Canaanite."

Bauer's main philological results may be summed up as follows: 1. In typical East-Canaanite theophorous names the verb precedes the noun, unlike Akkadian (and in some instances Hebrew) where the opposite arrangement is the rule. 2. The closest relative of East-Canaanite is Hebrew and its congeners, rather than South Arabic. 3. From the structure of the composite names it is possible to determine with certainty a number of new East-Canaanite deities.

The historical part is devoted to the proof that (a) the land and the people MAR-TU mentioned in the cuneiform texts of the third millennium, (b) the Western Semites of the dynasty of Hammurabi, and (c) the later principality of Amurru in the Lebanon district, are three entirely distinct and unrelated entities. The MAR-TU of the early Sargonide period are to be sought

north-east of Babylonia, and the existence of Western Amorites in the third millennium is to be emphatically denied. The East-Canaanites proper first appear in Babylonia during the period of the Hammurabi dynasty; their immediate provenance is the region east of the Tigris, where districts like Yamutbal must have been settled by them in very early times.

It is impossible to discuss here extensively Bauer's interesting theories, or to bring up controversial details in which the book abounds. A few remarks may be, however, illustrative of the reviewer's general reaction.

I do not feel that Bauer has successfully established his main thesis. To transplant the Amorites east of the Tigris is, in a way, trying to explain *ignotum per ignotius*. We do not know any more about Yamutbal in the third millennium than we know about Syria at the same period. At the same time we are not in position to disprove the assumption. That Semites were to be found from earliest times to the north and north-east of Babylonia is a suggestion that deserves careful consideration. In fact, the presence of non-Akkadian Semites in the second stratum at Tepe Gawra¹ may be viewed as partial confirmation of Bauer's views. On the other hand, the material cited by Bauer does not as yet justify the sweeping statements which the author makes, nor the categorical tone in which he words them.

The philological part of the work is on the whole excellent. It may be recommended as a model for preliminary grammatical studies in all cases where historical deductions are to be made from similar material. If Bauer sins here at all, it is by making his distinctions too hair-splitting at times. His names combining designations of two gods (p. 60, bottom) are not wholly convincing; his case for reading *Hammurabi* instead of *Hammurapi* (p. 53) does not appear as strong as he seems to believe. That the term *Subartu* is not found before the second millennium has been disproved by a recent text from Ur.²

All in all, the book is philologically sound, refreshing in its originality, and thoroughly stimulating.

E. A. SPEISER.

University of Pennsylvania.

¹ Cf. *Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research* (1929), IX, 18 ff.

² Gadd and Legrain, *Ur Excavations I* (1928), 274, col. I. 13.

Al-Rūwād (The Pioneers), being the second volume of the Biographical Dictionary (*A'lam*) of al-Mukṭaṭaf. AL-MUKṬATAF PRESS, Cairo, Egypt, 1927. Pp. 316.

This volume is a collection of articles that have appeared in the well-known Arabic magazine, al-Mukṭaṭaf, dealing with travel, geography, exploration, transportation and adventure. A lengthy chapter is devoted to Moslem geographers with brief biographical sketches of al-Birūnī, al-Idrīsī, Yāqūt, ibn-Baṭūṭah etc. Columbus, Sir Henry Stanley, George Schweinfurth, Nansen and other European explorers are treated fully. Byrd's expedition to the Arctic region and Lindbergh's flight over the Atlantic are signalled out as the two outstanding American achievements.

Bibliography: Enumerative and Historical, HENRY B. VAN HOESEN, with the collaboration of FRANK K. WALKER. CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, New York, 1928. Pp. 517. Price 7.50.

A book whose author asserts that its writing involved the accumulation of some 30,000 cards (p. 17) can not but inspire awe in the heart of the reviewer. While this manual could be used as a text-book for the student, as an epitome of bibliographical theory and practice for the librarian, author and collector, its usefulness to the Orientalist consists in its being a reference work listing, with some comment, the principal subject bibliographies in all departments of learning. Of the fifteen chapters, three are illustrated by more than eighty examples in the text.

Of special interest is chapter V (pp. 89-111) which treats art and archaeology, language and literature. Gabrieli's *Manuale de bibliografia musulmana* (p. 96) is considered the best bibliographical manual available, but no mention is made of any reference works in the Oriental languages themselves. Nor is there any mention of books in native languages under "National Bibliographies: Orient" (p. 236). In the Indo-Iranian field special reference is made to the *Cambridge History of India* (p. 98). Chapter XII (pp. 259-315) on the history of writing is up-to-date, thorough and profusely illustrated. The book closes with a bibliographical appendix in which the main works and periodicals referred to in the text are classified and listed.

Syntaxe des parlers arabes actuels du Liban, by Mgr. MICHEL FEGHALI. IMPRIMERIE NATIONALE, Paris, 1928. Pp. xxv, 535.

Mgr. Feghali, professor at the University of Bordeaux and author of *Le parler arabe de Kfar 'Abida*, of *Étude sur les emprunts syriaques dans les parlers arabes du Liban*, and of other works, has in this last contribution of his, which comes as a culmination to his previous studies and researches, placed the spoken dialect of northern Lebanon on what might be called a scientific basis. Himself born in the Lebanon and trained in the Western methods of linguistic investigation, the Monseigneur has rendered a service, in a sorely neglected field, which no one else perhaps could have rendered with an equal measure of success. Other than Marcel Cohen, W. Margais, and von Landberg, whose studies lie mainly in the field of the North African Arabic dialects, very few modern scholars have interested themselves in colloquial Arabic. What gives special importance to such studies is the fact that the Arabic dialects are being rapidly transformed under the influence of modern education.

In the first part (pp. 1-113) the author treats the verb in its perfect and imperfect tenses, illustrates its various usages, and compares it with the corresponding classical forms. He holds that the letter *bā'*, which introduces the imperfect in the colloquial, e. g. *biktub*, "I wish," is the classical preposition *bi-* (p. 26). Likewise the particle *man*, *man yiktub*, "he is writing," represents the classical preposition *min* (p. 43). Colloquial *baddi*, "I wish to," is a corruption of classical *bi-waddi*, "in my desire" (p. 64). Chapter III in this part takes up the question of the moods. In the second part (pp. 115-211) the agreement of the verb with its subject, and the relations between the substantive and its modifier from the standpoint of definiteness, number and gender are discussed. One chapter has for topic the comparative and the superlative; another, the cardinal and the ordinal numbers. The third part of the book (pp. 213-278) is devoted to a study of the particle in its nominal and verbal forms and in its independent and subordinate varieties. The fourth part (pp. 282-339) treats the pronoun; and the fifth part (pp. 349-486), the invariable words including the preposition, conjunction, and adverb.

One general criticism of the work is that in the main it treats

the various dialects of Lebanon as though they constituted one homogeneous whole, whereas the book is written particularly from the standpoint of the dialect in vogue among the Maronites in central and northern Lebanon. "*Le dialecte libanais*" which uses *la t-wākhḏūna*, "excuse us," (p. 129) is that of the north; a southern Lebanese would say *la twākhḏhūna*. A southern Lebanese would also say *waqa'u* instead of *waq'u* "they fell" (p. 129), *b'iḏek* in place of *bidek*, "in your hand" (p. 102), *la'indu* and not *l'indu*, "to his home" (p. 101) etc. Beirut, the capital of Lebanon, has quite a distinct dialect of its own. The Druzes of southern Lebanon have their own well-marked dialectal peculiarities, and so have the Matāwilah (Shī'ite Moslems) of the Sidon region, and other denominational and regional communities. The reviewer is familiar with five villages in Lebanon within a radius of three miles from each other, whose population are Druzes, Matāwilah, Maronites, and Greek Orthodox; and any one of them can be easily identified from his speech and recognized as belonging to one or another of these communities—so marked are the phonetic, morphological, and dialectal differences.

PHILIP K. HITTI.

The poems of Nizami, by LAURENCE BINYON. London: STUDIO OFFICE, 1928. 30 pp., 16 plates.

This publication of one of the finest Persian Manuscripts in the British Museum may be cordially welcomed. The text includes chapters on Shāh Ṭahmāsp and his painters, on Painting in Persia, on the Life of Nizami, and an analysis of the Five Poems of the Khamsa.

The manuscript itself is due to the well known calligrapher Shāh Maḥmūd Nishābūrī; the splendid paintings in it are by Mirak, Mirzā 'Alī, Sulṭān Muḥammad, Mīr Sayyid 'Alī, and Muzaffar 'Alī, and two are unsigned. All represent the school of Biḥzād's immediate followers, and precede the decadence of Persian art that took place under Shāh 'Abbās I.

The miniatures are very successfully reproduced; better results could only have been obtained at a cost which would have greatly increased the present very moderate price of the volume. This is a book that all students of Persian painting will wish to possess.

Le Bayon d'Angkor et l'évolution de l'art khmer, by PHILIPPE STERN. Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque de Vulgarisation, T. 47. Paris: GEUTHNER, 1927. Pp. xii, 217, with 22 plates.

This very careful and valuable study revolutionises the accepted chronology of Cambodian monuments dateable between the Roluoh group (880, 893 A. D.) and Añkor Wat (ca. 1150 A. D.). Stylistic and iconographic sequences, combined with the study of the inscriptions, lead to a new dating as follows:

Pre-Añkorian period, 5th-7th, perhaps-8th century (pre-Khmer, Indo-Khmer of other authors) characterised by isolated towers of brick or laterite.

First Añkorian period, 802-end of 10th century. Grouped but not connected, towers of the Roluoh type (= art of Indravarman as now restricted). First Añkor city plan, with four gates only and roads leading to the then central temple of Phimānākās. Phnom Baken. Koh Ker, 928-944. Later, Pre Rup, Tā Keo. Close of first period, Prāh Vihār, Phnom Cisor, and the Baphuon, the latter with transitional details.

Second Añkorian period. Buddha of Tep Pranām, ca. 1005. Prāh Khān (*not* therefore to be identified with the old Hariharālaya). Sūryavarman I, 1002-1049, probably the great builder to whom are due the new city plan with the Bayon as central temple, necessitating a fifth gateway and road, the palace terraces, Tā Prohm, Bantāy Kdei; all these are in one style, but cannot yet be arranged in chronological sequence *inter se*. The Bayon, now known to have been originally Buddhist, and to have undergone two changes of plan before its completion, was probably begun by Sūryavarman and completed by his successor Udayādityavarman. Beñ Mālā also belongs to this period. Añkor Wat, dateable between 1115 and 1180, probably before 1150, "colder and more perfect," is the last monument of this period.

Third Añkorian period, late 12th to 14th century, represented chiefly by the temple of Ísvarapura at Bantāy Srei "fatigued et archaisant."

The new dating, which seems to be meeting with general acceptance, makes the history of Cambodian art far more intelligible than heretofore; in particular, it removes the difficulty of having to re-

gard two such different styles as those of the Roluoh group and the Bayon as contemporaneous, and places the Bayon, with its reliefs so clearly related to and anticipatory of those of Añkor Wat, not more than a century earlier than the latter monument.

Chalukyan architecture. By H. COUSENS. Archaeological Survey of India, New Imperial Series, Vol. XLII. Calcutta, 1926. viii + 158 pp., 160 plates.

This is an example of the old style publications of the Archaeological Survey, in which a very large number of buildings of various dates are summarily described. It is little more than a convenient compilation of matter already published in the Annual Reports and other volumes of the Survey; few if any of the illustrations are new, nor are the reproductions of good quality. One would gladly give the whole book for a detailed monograph on a single one of the major temples referred to in it.

ANANDA K. COOMARASWAMY.

Museum of Fine Arts,

NOTES OF THE SOCIETY

The following persons have been elected to membership by vote of the Executive Committee:

Dr. Frederick W. Dickinson
Dean Frederick C. Grant
Prof. Eldon Griffin
Prof. Obed S. Johnson
Mr. Ganda Singh Kewal
Rev. George J. Lapp

Mr. David N. Mosessohn
Dr. Pair-Mall
Mr. C. H. Smiley
Dean Lee Vrooman
Prof. Alban G. Widgery

Dr. William F. Warren, of Brookline, Mass., president emeritus of Boston University, and for fifty-two years a member of this Society, died on December 6, 1929, at the age of 96.

FONDATION DE GOEJE.—COMMUNICATION.

1. Le bureau de la fondation n'a pas subi de modifications depuis le mois de novembre 1928, et est ainsi composé: C. Snouck Hurgronje (président), M. Th. Houtsma, Tj. De Boer, J. J. Salverda de Grave et C. Van Vollenhoven (secrétaire-trésorier).

2. Des huit publications de la fondation il reste un certain nombre d'exemplaires, qui sont mis en vente au profit de la fondation, chez l'éditeur E. J. Brill, aux prix marqués: 1. Reproduction photographique du manuscrit de Leyde de la *Ḥamāsah* de al-Buḥturi (1909), fl. 96; 2. *Kitāb al-Fāḥkir* de al-Mufaḍḍal, éd. C. A. Storey (1915), fl. 6; 3. *Streitschrift des Ġazālī gegen die Bāṭinijja-Sekte*, par I. Goldziher (1916), fl. 4.50; 4. *Bar Hebraeus's Book of the Dove*, éd. A. J. Wensinck (1919), fl. 4.50; 5. *De Opkomst van het Zaidietische Imamaat in Yemen*, par C. Van Arendonk (1919), fl. 6; 6. *Die Richtungen der Islamischen Koranauslegung*, par I. Goldziher (1920), fl. 10; 7. *Die Epitome der Metaphysik des Averroes*, übersetzt und mit einer Einleitung und Erläuterungen versehen, par S. van den Bergh (1924), fl. 7.50; 8. Les "*Livres des Chevaux*", par G. Levi della Vida (1928), fl. 5.

Novembre 1929.

Professor Samuel A. B. Mercer, of the University of Toronto, has set out for Abyssinia to photograph manuscripts of the Old Testament in Ethiopic. He is planning the edition of a reliable text of the Ethiopic Old Testament.

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
American Oriental Society

AT THE MEETING IN CAMBRIDGE, MASS., 1929

The sessions of the one hundred and forty-first meeting of the Society were held in Cambridge, Mass., at Harvard University, on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, April 2, 3, and 4, 1929, in conjunction with the Second Conference on the Promotion of Chinese Studies under the auspices of the American Council of Learned Societies.

The following members were present at one or more sessions:

Archer	Goodrich	Newell
Bailey	Gordon, H. L.	Ogden, C. J.
Barret	Graves	Ogden, Miss
Bates, Mrs.	Hail	Porter
Bender	Hodous	Reich
Bishop	Hummel	Reilly
Brown, G. W.	Hussey, Miss	Ropes
Bull	Jackson, A. V. W.	Rudolph, Miss
Burrows	Jackson, Mrs.	Shryock
Butin	Joshi, S. L.	Smith, Miss L. P.
Chapin, Miss	Joshi, S. S.	Speiser
Clark	Lanman	von Stael-Holstein
Coomaraswamy	Latourette	Stephens
Creighton	Laufer	Sturtevant
De Long	Luce	Taylor, C. L.
De Witt, Mrs.	Lyon	Torrey
Dougherty	Malone	Uhl
Duncan, G. S.	March	Ussher
Edgerton, F.	Margolis, M. L.	Vályi
Enslin	Martin	Ware, J. R.
Fenn	Martinovitch	Weitzel
Fernald, Miss	Matthews, I. G.	Wood, H.
Fowler	Montgomery	Zeitlin
Gale	Moore, G. F.	
Gavin	Morgenstern	

Total 73

There were also present as guests of the Society some of those

attending the Conference on the Promotion of Chinese Studies, including the following who read or discussed papers: Dr. J. J. L. Duyvendak, of the University of Leiden and Columbia University; Mr. C. S. Gardner, of Boston; Prof. Edwin D. Harvey, of Dartmouth College; Prof. William Hung, of the Harvard-Yenching Institute; Dr. K. H. Kiang, of Nan Fang University; Mr. K. T. Mei, of Harvard University; Prof. H. F. Rudd, of the University of New Hampshire, and Miss Nancy Lee Swann, of the Gest Chinese Research Library, Montreal.

THE FIRST SESSION

At 11.00 A. M. on Tuesday, in Phillips Brooks House, the first session of the meeting was called to order by President Franklin Edgerton. The reading of the minutes of the meeting in Washington in 1928 was dispensed with as they were already in print (JOURNAL 48. 326-352). There were no corrections and the minutes were approved.

Professor Clark of Harvard University, chairman of the Committee on Arrangements, presented his committee's report in the form of a printed program. The succeeding sessions were announced to be on Tuesday afternoon at 2.30 P. M., Wednesday morning at 9.30 A. M., Wednesday afternoon at 2.30 P. M., and Thursday morning at 9.30 A. M. It was announced that the members of the Society were invited to luncheon at the Commander Hotel on Tuesday as the guests of Professor Jewett of Harvard University, who unfortunately was not able to be in Cambridge for the meeting. It was also announced that the members of the Society were invited to an informal reception at Phillips Brooks House on Tuesday evening, and that the annual subscription dinner of the Society would be at the Commander Hotel on Wednesday evening.

REPORT OF THE CORRESPONDING SECRETARY

The Corresponding Secretary, Dr. Charles J. Ogden, presented the following report:

The year 1928 was one of significant growth in our numbers. No less than 153 new corporate members were elected, largely through the efforts of the Committee on Enlargement of Membership and Resources, and, although 53 others were lost, the net gain remains exactly one hundred. Since the beginning of this year 36 members have been elected, 19 have

resigned, and the deaths of two have been reported, so that the total of our corporate membership is now 741, a figure double that of ten years ago. This increase, gratifying as it is, has added so much to the routine work of the Corresponding Secretary, that it is becoming a problem how to carry this on adequately in the limited amount of time that any one person may be expected to devote to it. Theoretically a central office for all the administrative functions of the Society would be desirable, but investigation has shown that such an arrangement is not yet practicable. Our Society is in the transition from a comparatively small group of scholars to a national and even international one of those who are interested in the ancient and the cultural aspects of the modern Orient, and we must accept the inconveniences of this stage of growth.

The President of the Society and the Corresponding Secretary attended by invitation the First Conference on the Promotion of Chinese Studies, held in New York City on December 1st, 1928, an undertaking of much consequence to that branch of Oriental scholarship and one in which all our members, whatever their specialty, should feel an interest, since the problem of fostering the growth of Chinese studies in this country is not essentially different from that which confronts us in other fields. Your Secretary also participated as usual in the annual conference of the secretaries of the societies belonging to the American Council of Learned Societies, held in Washington on January 25, 1929, and attended the meeting of the Council itself on the following day.

The new plan of holding some sectional sessions, which has been put into effect this year, may perhaps be best judged from the program itself, without comment by the Secretary; but he may be permitted to say that without such an arrangement this year it would have been impossible to give the Sinological papers the special place that belonged to them in connection with the Second Chinese Conference. Whether the scheme should be followed as a rule depends very much on the size of each meeting and the proportion of papers in each field, matters that cannot be determined in advance.

The Society has been unusually fortunate during the past year in that we have lost only six members by death, a number much less than the average, yet the mention of some of their names must be attended with keen regret.

KARL FRIEDRICH GELDNER, Ph. D., an honorary member of our Society since 1905, pursued his Oriental and philological studies at Leipzig and Tübingen and taught successively at Tübingen, Halle, and Berlin before he became professor of Indic philology at Marburg, in 1907, a position that he held for the remainder of his academic career. As a scholar he was at home in both Indic and Iranian studies, his earlier work being especially devoted to the latter and culminating in his great text-edition of the Avesta, published in three volumes, 1885-1896. Vedic exegesis claimed his later years, his most noteworthy productions being the three volumes of *Vedische Studien* in collaboration with Richard Pischel, 1889-1901, his own *Rigveda in Auswahl*, of which the *Glossar* appeared in 1907 and the

Kommentar in 1909, and his final achievement, the *Translation* of the *Rig-veda* now appearing in the Harvard Oriental Series. He died on February 5, 1929, at the age of 75.

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD, Ph. D., LL. D., L. H. D., for forty-five years professor of Sanskrit and comparative philology in the Johns Hopkins University, has already received an appreciation in the pages of our JOURNAL (48. 193-199), to which nothing could be added here, even if he were not still fresh in the memory of us all. Yet attention may be called to those aspects of his career which have a special connection with this Society, his service as its President in 1910-1911, and as a member of the Board of Directors for over forty years, his constant attendance at our meetings so long as his health permitted, and his long array of contributions to our JOURNAL, which ceased only with his death. Lending distinction to our sessions by his lucid presentation of truth and unsparing exposure of error and to our social gatherings by the variety and brilliance of his conversation, he held a place among us that will never be filled for those who have had the fortune to know him. He became a member in 1881, and died on June 13, 1928, at the age of 73.

Rev. JAMES DALLAS STEELE, Ph. D., D. D., of Rutherford, N. J., who entered the Presbyterian ministry in 1891, had held pastorates in New York and New Jersey, and was lecturer on ecclesiastical law in the Bloomfield Theological Seminary and Moderator of the Synod of New Jersey at the time of his decease. He had been a student and teacher of Hebrew and Old Testament literature and was a frequent attendant at our meetings. He was elected a member in 1892, and died on December 6, 1928, at the age of 64.

JOHN G. WHITE, A. M., LL. D., of Cleveland, Ohio, was a lawyer by profession and active in the civic life of his native town, having been president of the Public Library Board of Cleveland since 1913. He was a collector of books, especially on the subject of chess. He was elected a member in 1912, and died on August 27, 1928, at the age of 83.

HENRY LANE ENO, a member of a well-known New York family, was formerly research associate in psychology in Princeton University and a benefactor of that institution. For some years he had been residing abroad. He was elected a member in 1916 and died on September 10, 1928, at the age of 57.

FELIX FULD, of Newark, N. J., a merchant distinguished for his philanthropic activities and his patronage of music and art, was elected a member in 1928 and died on January 20, 1929, at the age of 60.

Upon motion the report of the Corresponding Secretary was accepted.

Tribute was paid to deceased members: to Professor Bloomfield by Dr. Uhl; to Professor Geldner by Professor Jackson.

The following minute was unanimously adopted:

WHEREAS, the American Oriental Society is conscious of a great loss

sustained in the death of Maurice Bloomfield, for nearly half a century a member, sometime vice-president and president of the Society, active at its meetings and on its programs, wise in its councils, and devoted to its interests; and,

WHEREAS, in his inspiring career as a teacher, in his interpretation of the East to the West, of the past to the present, in the depth and scope of his learning, in the originality and value of his researches, he vividly embodied the ideals of the Society; be it therefore

Resolved, that the Society here record its keen sense of the great loss sustained in his death and its desire to cherish his memory; and be it further

Resolved, that these resolutions be entered in the minutes of the Society, and that copies of them be sent to the members of his family.

On motion it was voted unanimously to send to Professor Warren, the oldest member of the Society in point of age, the good wishes of the Society and regrets that he was unable to be present at the meeting.

REPORT OF THE TREASURER

The Treasurer, Professor John C. Archer, made the following report:

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES FOR THE YEAR ENDING DECEMBER 31, 1928

Receipts

Cash Balance Jan. 1, 1928, on deposit Yale Univ.	\$4,174.69
Dues from 544 members.....	2,879.42
Sales: JOURNAL (gross) to Jan. 31, 1928.....	966.76
Panchatantra	61.07
Tagalog Grammar.....	42.96
Gift from Prof. Jewett for pub'n of Catalog of the Society's Library.....	1,000.00
Income, Nies Fund.....	522.50
Liberty Bond redeemed.....	1,000.00
A. C. L. S. for expenses of Delegates.....	14.20
Corrections in JOURNAL.....	78.25
Reprints of JOURNAL articles.....	23.65
Interest:	
On deposits with Yale Univ. @ 4½%.....	207.95
U. S. Liberty Bond @ 4¼%.....	42.50
Connecticut Mortgage and Guar. Co. 6%.....	360.00
Virginia Ry. 5%.....	50.00
Minneap. Gen. Electric Co. 5%.....	50.00

Dividend:

Chicago, Rock Is. and Pacific Ry.....	120.00
	<hr/> \$11,593.95

Expenditures

Publication of JOURNAL:

Printing	\$2,087.83	
Corrections	168.50	
Reprints	89.65	
Book Reviews.....	66.00	
Transportation and Envelopes printed.....	196.57	
Mailing of JOURNAL.....	128.00	
Commission on Sales (Yale Press) (JOURNAL)...	241.69	
Panchatantra	14.01	
Tagalog Grammar.....	10.70	
Membership Committee expenses.....	179.51	
Am. Sch. for Indo-Iran. Research Com. expenses..	8.71	
Dues to American Council of Learned Societies..	32.90	
Executive Comm. Travel.....	8.82	
Delegates' expenses.....	28.40	
Middle West Branch A. O. S. expenses.....	5.38	
Yale Clerical Bureau.....	109.61	
Library purchases and expenses.....	20.15	
Corresponding Secretary expenses.....	173.30	
Editors' expenses.....	29.44	
Honoraria: Editors.....	400.00	
Treasurer	100.00	
Balance Dec. 31, 1928.....	7,494.78	
		<hr/> \$11,593.95

The following *special funds* are held by the Society:

Charles W. Bradley Fund.....	\$3,000.00	
Alexander I. Cotheal Fund.....	1,500.00	
William Dwight Whitney Fund.....	1,000.00	
Life Membership.....	3,675.00	
Publication Fund <i>with interest</i>	82.03	
Fund from sales of Panchatantra and Tagalog Grammar <i>with interest</i>	644.77	
Nies Fund Income <i>with interest</i> revised @ 4½%.	3,528.83	
Reserve, approximately.....	2,000.00	
		<hr/> \$15,430.63

The *Assets* of the Society on Jan. 1, 1929, were as follows:

Chicago, Rock Is. and Pacific Ry. stock (20 shares @ par value)	\$2,000.00	
Bonds at par:		
Virginia Railway.....	1,000.00	
Minneapolis Gen'l Electric Co.....	1,000.00	
Connecticut Mortgage and Guar. Co. mortgage....	6,000.00	
Cash on deposit with Yale University.....	7,494.78	
		<hr/> \$17,494.78
<i>Net Cash Balance, General Funds</i> (incl. Jewett gift)	\$2,064.15	

REPORT OF THE AUDITING COMMITTEE

We hereby certify that we have examined the accounts of the Treasurer of the Society and have found them correct, and that the foregoing statements are in conformity therewith.

R. P. DOUGHERTY,
K. S. LATOURETTE,
Auditors.

Upon motion the reports of the Treasurer and the Auditing Committee were accepted.

REPORT OF THE LIBRARIAN

The report of the Librarian, Professor Andrew Keogh, who was unable to be present, was read by the Corresponding Secretary.

The Librarian reported that the cataloguing of both books and periodicals in the Society's library was up to date, and that estimates for the printing of the catalogue had been received from two firms and that a third estimate was promised. It was anticipated that the catalogue would be printed before the end of the year.

ACCESSIONS TO THE LIBRARY FOR THE YEAR 1928-29

The number of volumes added to the Library during the year 1928-29 was 238, about twice the number ordinarily received in any one year. This unusual increase in accessions was due to the transfer from the Yale Library of a considerable number of duplicates of Oriental significance. In addition to the above, there were received 686 numbers of periodicals continuing sets already in the Library or representing periodicals new to the Library. This equally unusual increase is due to the sustained effort that has been made to obtain lacking parts of the more important periodicals; an effort resulting in the receipt by the Library of more than 300 back numbers.

Following is a list of accessions for the year:

*Abd al-Muqtadir. Commentaries on the Qurân. 1928. (Bankipore, Bengal. Oriental public library. Catalogue of the Arabic and Persian mss., v. XIV (Persian mss.))

Abdul Hamîd. Şûfism. 1928. (Bankipore, Bengal. Oriental public library. Catalogue of the Arabic and Persian mss., v. XIII (Arabic mss.))

- Abel, K. Slavic and Latin. 1883. (Ilchester lectures.)
- [Abū al-Fadhl ibn Mubārak, *al Hindī*.] Ayeen Akbery. Tr. by F. Gladwin. 1800. 2v.
- Adriani, N. Bare'e-Nederlandsch woordenboek. 1928.
- Agrell, S. Nablūdeniā nad kolebaniem udarenīā v russkom glagoliē. 1917. (Archives d'études orientales, v. 12.)
- Akademiā nauk, Petrograd. Proben orientalischer Schriften der akademischen Druckerei. 1928.
- Systematisches Verzeichnis über die Veröffentlichungen. 1. Januar 1917–1. September 1925. [1928?]
- Aldrich, J. M. Five new parasitic flies reared from beetles in China and India. 1928.
- Three new species of two-winged flies of the family *Bombyliidae* from India. 1928.
- Alger, W. R. The poetry of the Orient. 1865.
- ‘Alī Muhammad Khān. The supplement to the Mirat-i-Ahmedi. 1924.
- American council of learned societies. Bulletin, no. 8. [1928]
- Amsterdam. Koloniaal instituut. Afdeeling volkenkunde. Gids in het Volkenkundig museum, IV-VI. [1928?] 3v.
- Andraē, T. Die Person Muhammeds. 1918. (Archives d'études orientales, v. 16.)
- Arends, A. K. Persidsko-russkii slovar' fizicheskikh terminov. 1928. (Materialy dlia slovaria zhivogo persidskogo iazyka, 1.)
- Asiatic society of Japan. List of books published in the Transactions. 1923.
- Banerji-Sāstrī, A. Asura India. 1926.
- Baring-Gould, S. The origin and development of religious belief. Pt. 1. 1870.
- Barth, H. Travels and discoveries in North and Central Africa. 1857-59. 3v.
- Bartholomaeis, V. de. Le carte di Giovanni Maria Barbieri. 1927.
- Bataviaasch genootschap van kunsten en wetenschappen. Verslag der viering van den 150sten gedenkdag. [1928.]
- Bell, A. M. Sounds and their relations. 1881.
- Bernice Pauahi Bishop museum of Polynesian ethnology and natural history, Honolulu. Occasional papers, v. 1, nos. 2-3, 5; v. 2, nos. 1-5; v. 4, nos. 2-5; v. 5, nos. 2, 4-5; v. 6, nos. 1-2, 5; v. 7, nos. 1-2, 8, 10. 1900-21.
- A preliminary catalogue. 1892-93. 5v. in 1.
- Special publication 9-12. 1924-27.
- Memoirs, v. 1, no. 1-2, 4-5; v. 2, no. 1-2; v. 3; v. 7, no. 1; v. 9, no. 1-5. 1899-1928.
- Bulletin, 6-9, 11-12, 15, 17-18, 23, 29, 32, 34, 39, 42, 46, 48, 57. 1923-28.
- Bhāsa. Wāsawadattā, übers. von H. Weller. 1926. (Indische Dichter, Bd. 3.)
- Bickell, G. Outlines of Hebrew grammar. 1877.
- Blackie, J. S. The language and literature of the Scottish highlands. 1876.

- Bombay historical society. Journal. v. 1, no. 1-2. [1928.]
- Bose, Phanindra Nath. Principles of Indian Śilpaśāstra. 1926. (The Punjab oriental (Sanskrit) series, [no. 11?])
- Bowman, J. W. The Robertson codex. 1928.
- Brinton, D. G. The myths of the New World. 1868.
- British association for the advancement of science. al-ʿIlm wal-ʿimrān, hadiyyat al-Mukṭataf al-sanawiyya 1928. [1928.]
- Carnegie endowment for international peace. Year book, 1913/14, 1916. 1914-16. 2v.
- Chalmers, J. The origin of the Chinese. 1866.
- Chandra Chakravartī. The United States of America. 1924.
- Chandra Chakravartī. Western civilization. 1927.
- China institute in America. The China institute in America, by E. Shen. [1928?]
- Christensen, A. E. Les types du premier homme et du premier roi dans l'histoire légendaire des Iraniens. 1.ptie. 1917. (Archives d'études orientales, v. 14.)
- Clay, A. T. Business documents of Murashu sons of Nippur, dated in the reign of Darius II. 1912. (Pennsylvania University Museum. Babylonian section. Publications, v. II, no. 1.)
- Clay, A. T. Documents from the temple archives of Nippur, dated in the reigns of Cassite rulers. 1912. (Pennsylvania University Museum. Babylonian section. Publications, v. II, no. 2.)
- Colebrooke, Sir T. E., ed. The life of H. T. Colebrooke. 1873.
- Coomaraswamy, A. K. Yakṣas. 1928. (Smithsonian miscellaneous collections, v. 80, no. 6. Publication 2926.)
- Cousens, H. The Chālukyan architecture of the Kanarese districts. 1926. (India. Archæological survey. [Reports.] New imperial series, v. XLII.)
- Culbertson, M. S. Darkness in the flowery land. 1857.
- Curtius, G. Die Bildung der Tempora und Modi im Griechischen und Lateinischen sprachvergleichend dargestellt. 1846. (His Sprachvergleichende Beiträge zur griechischen und lateinischen Grammatik. Erster Theil.)
- Curtius, G. Grundzüge der griechischen Etymologie. 3. Aufl. 1869.
——— 5. Aufl. 1879.
- Das Verbum der griechischen Sprache. 1873-76. 2v. in 1.
- Cust, R. N. A sketch of the modern languages of Africa. 1883. 2v. (Trübner's Oriental series.)
- Dall, W. H. Alaska and its resources. 1870.
- Daśabhumika-sūtram. Seventh stage. By J. Rahder. [1925?]
- Dasopant Charitra. Dasopant Digambar. Translation of the Dasopant Charitra. By J. E. Abbott. [1928.] (The Poet-saints of Maharashtra, no. 4.)
- Davids, T. W. R. Lectures on the origin and growth of religion. 1881. (The Hibbert lectures, 1881.)
- Deutsch, E. O. M. Literary remains of the late Emanuel Deutsch. 1874.

- Deutsche morgenländische Gesellschaft. Deutsche morgenländische Gesellschaft 1845-1928. [1928?]
- De Vere, M. S. The great empress. 1870.
- Douse, T. LeM. Grimm's law. 1876.
- Duncker, M. W. Geschichte des Alterthums. 3. Bd. 1875.
- Dunlap, S. F. Vestiges of the spirit-history of man. 1858.
- Dutch East Indies. Natuurwetenschappelijke raad voor Nederlandsch-Indië. [Publications] no. 1. 1928.
- Dwight, B. W. Modern philology. 1st ser. 1859.
- Egorov, D. N., ed. Bibliografiâ Vostoka . . . pod obshchei redaktsiei . . . D. N. Egorova. vyp. 1. 1928.
- Ekblom, R. Rus- et vareg- dans les noms de lieux de la région de Novgorod. 1915. (Archives d'études orientales . . . v. 11.)
- Eliot, C. W. Some roads towards peace. 1914. (Carnegie endowment for international peace. Div. of intercourse and education. Publ. no. 1.)
- Ellis, A. J. Practical hints on the quantitative pronunciation of Latin. 1874.
- Erwast, K. Finnisch-deutsches Wörterbuch. 1888. (Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seuran toimituksia, 69. osa.)
- Ewald, G. H. A. Ausführliches Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Bundes. 1844.
- Farrar, F. W. Families of speech. 1870.
- Field museum of natural history, Chicago. Field museum and the child. 1928.
- Firdausi. Heldensagen . . . übers. . . von F. von Schack. 1851.
- Fowler, H. W. and Bean, B. A. Fishes of the families *Pomacentridae*, *Labridae*, and *Callyodontidae*, collected in Philippine seas. 1928. (U. S. National museum. Bulletin 100, v. 7.)
- Fowler, W. C. English grammar. 1850.
- Friederici, K. Bibliotheca orientalis. 1-8. Jahrg. 1876-83. 8v. in 1.
- Gardner, E. A. Naukratis. Pt. 2. 1888. (6th memoir of the Egypt exploration fund.)
- Gibbs, J. W. Philological studies. 1857.
- Grant, F. C. New horizons of the Christian faith. [c1928.] (The Hale lectures, 1927-28.)
- Gt. Brit. India office. Library. Catalogue of the Hindustani mss., by J. F. Blumhardt. 1926.
- Gudea, *patesi of Lagash*. The great cylinder inscriptions A and B. Pt. II. 1927. (Assyriologische Bibliothek, Bd. XXVI.)
- Hackin, J., ed. and tr. Formulaire sanscrit-tibétain du Xe siècle. 1924. (Mission Pelliot en Asie centrale. [Publications] Sér. petit in-octavo, t. II.)
- Harper, R. I. Assyrian and Babylonian letters belonging to the *K[ouyunjik]* collection of the British museum. Pt. 1. 1892.
- Harrington, J. P. Vocabulary of the Kiowa language. 1928. (U. S. Bureau of American ethnology. Bulletin 84.)
- Hasluck, F. W. Letters on religion and folklore. 1926.

- Hauer, J. W. *Das Lankāvatāra-sūtra und das Sāṃkhya*. 1927. (Beiträge zur indischen Sprachwissenschaft und Religionsgeschichte, 1. Hft.)
- Hazard, R. G. *Essay on language and other essays*. . . . Ed. by C. Hazard. 1889.
- Heyse, K. W. L. *System der Sprachwissenschaft*. Hrsg. von H. Steintal. 1856.
- Hopkins, M. *Miscellaneous essays and discourses*. 1847.
- Hough, W. *Fire-making apparatus in the U. S. National museum*. 1928.
- Howsin, H. H. *The significance of Indian nationalism*. [192-?] *The Humanist*, pub. by the Humanistic club. v. I, no. 6. 1928.
- Humboldt, A. *Kosmos*. 1845-62. 5v.
- Imbrie, W. *Handbook of English-Japanese etymology*. 1880.
- [Imube no Hironari.] Kogoshui, tr. by Genchi Kato and Hikoshirō Hoshino. 3d ed. 1926.
- India. Dept. of agriculture. *Memoirs. Chemical series*, v. X, no. 1. 1928.
- Instituut Kern, Leyden. *Annual bibliography of Indian archaeology for the year 1926*. 1928.
- International commission to inquire into the causes and conduct of the Balkan wars. *Report of the International commission*. 1914. (Carnegie endowment for international peace. Div. of intercourse and education. Publ. no. 4.)
- Iran I-II. Leningrad, 1927-28.
- iṣvara Kaula. *A dictionary of the Kāshmirī language*, comp. by G. A. Grierson, pt. II. 1924. (Bibliotheca Indica. New series, no. 1464.)
- Japan. Dept. of railways. *An official guide to eastern Asia*. v. 2. 1914.
- Journal of Egyptian archaeology*, v. XIII, pts. III-IV. Oct. 1927.
- Juhlakirja Yrjö Wichmannin kuusikymmentuotispäiväksi. 1928. (Suomalaisugrilaisen seuran Toimituksia LVIII.)
- Kallas, O. *Die Wiederholungslieder der estnischen Volkspoesie*. I. 1901. (Suomalais-ugrilaisen seuran Toimituksia XVI, 1.)
- Kaltschmidt, J. H. *Sprachvergleichendes Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. 1839.
- Karlgren, B. *Études sur la phonologie chinoise*. 1915-26. (Archives d'études orientales, v. 15.)
- Kāthakagrhyasūtra, ed. by W. Caland. [1st ed.] 1925.
- Kato, Genchi. *A study of Shinto*. 1926.
- Kaye, G. R. *The Bakhshālī manuscript*. 1927. (India. Archaeological survey. [Reports.] New imperial series, v. XLIII.)
- Kelsey, F. W. *Excavations at Carthage, 1925; a preliminary report*. 1926.
- Kent, R. G. *The textual criticism of inscriptions*. 1926. (Language monographs, no. 2.)
- Key, T. H. *Language: its origin and development*. 1874.
- Kiepert, H. *Lehrbuch der alten Geographie*. 1878.
- Kohut, G. A. *The Alexander Kohut memorial foundation: a statement*. [1928?]
- Concerning A. Kohut. *A tentative bibliography*. 1927.
- Royal Hebraists. 1927.

- Kolmodin, J. A., *tr.* Traditions de Tsazzege et Hazzega. Traduction française. 1915. (Archives d'études orientales, v. 5: 2.)
- Krieger, H. W. A prehistoric pit house village site on the Columbia River. 1928.
- Kṛishṇa-Svāmi Aiyangār. Manimekhalai in its historical setting. [1928.] (Madras. University. Special lectures.)
- Latham, R. G. Elements of comparative philology. 1862.
- Law, Bimala Charan. The life and work of Buddhaghosa. 1923. (Calcutta oriental series, no. 9. E. 3.)
- Law, Bimala Charan. Some Kṣatriya tribes of ancient India. 1924.
- Lele, B. C. Some Atharvanic portions in the Gṛhya-sūtras. 1927.
- Liebich, B. Konkordanz Panini-Candra. 1928. (Indische Forschungen, 6. Hft.)
- Lindblom, G. Kamba folklore, I. 1928. (Archives d'études orientales, v. 20: 1.)
- Outlines of a Tharaka grammar. 1914. (Archives d'études orientales, v. 9.)
- Linguistic society of America. Bulletin, no. 3, March, 1929.
- Literatur-Blatt für orientalische Philologie. I-III. Bd., 1883-87.
- Loos-Haaxman, J. de. Johannes Rach en zijn werk. [1928.]
- Loveridge, A. Field notes on vertebrates collected by the Smithsonian Chrysler East African expedition of 1926. 1928.
- Lyell, Sir C. The geological evidences of the antiquity of man. 2d American, from the latest London ed. 1863.
- Madvig, J. N. Kleine philologische Schriften. Leipzig, 1875.
- Mätzner, E. Englische Grammatik. 2. Aufl. 1873-75. 3v. in 1.
- Mahābhārata, ed. by Vishnu S. Sukthankar. Adiparvan: fasc. 1. 1927.
- Mahipati. Bhanudas, *tr.* from Mahipati's Bhaktavijaya [by J. E. Abbott.] [1926?] (The Poet-saints of Maharashtra, no. 1.)
- Eknath, *tr.* by J. E. Abbott. [1927.] (The Poet-saints of Maharashtra, no. 2.)
- Mammaṭa Āchārya. Kavyaprakasha, *tr.* by Ganganatha Jha. 1925.
- March, F. A. Introduction to Anglo-Saxon. 1870.
- Marsh, G. P. Lectures on the English language. 1860.
- The origin and history of the English language. 1862.
- Massis, an organ of Armenian interests, v. 1, no. 1-5. Nov. 1928-Mar. 1929.
- Mennechet, E. Leçons de littérature française classique. 1868.
- Meyer, L. Die gothische Sprache. 1869.
- Milindapañha. The Milindapañho, ed. by V. Trenckner. 1928. (James G. Forlong fund, v. V.)
- Mir-ali-Shir, *sbornik k piatisotletiiu so dnia rozhdeniia*. 1928.
- Mir Khwānd. Mirchond's Geschichte der Seldschuken . . . übers. von J. A. Vullers. 1837.
- Morris, R. Elementary lessons in historical English grammar. 1874.
- Müller, F. Allgemeine Ethnographie. 1873.
- Müller, F. M. Chips from a German workshop. 1869-81. 5v. in 4.

- Müller, F. M. Lectures on the origin and growth of religion. 1879. (The Hibbert lectures [1878].)
- Lectures on the science of language. 1863-65. 2v.
- On missions. 1874.
- On the stratification of language. 1868. (Rede lecture.)
- Science of language. 1891. 2v.
- Myhrman, D. V. Sumerian administrative documents, dated in the reigns of the kings of the second dynasty of Ur. 1910. (Pennsylvania. University. Babylonian expedition. Ser. A: Cuneiform texts, v. III, pt. 1.)
- Nauchnaia assotsiatsiia vostokovedeniia Soiūza S. S. R., Moscow. Piat' let sovetskogo vostokovedeniia (deiatel'-nost' Nauchnoi assotsiatsii vostokovedeniia SSSR). 1927.
- Nekrasov, N. A. Red-nosed frost. . . . Tr. in the original meters. 1886. ——— 2d ed. 1887.
- [Nenjukov, F.] Index plantarum estonicarum. Ed. altera. 1928. (Eesti kirjanduse seltsi Toimetused, nr. 23.)
- Nouvel orient, revue de l'Association russe pour les études orientales, v. 22. 1928.
- Oriens, the oriental review, no. 2, v. 1, avril 1926.
- Orient und Occident. 3. Bd., Hft. 1. 1866.
- The Oriental world. Organ Vseukraïns'koï naukovoï asotsiatsiï skhodoznavstva. No. 1-2, 6. 1927-28.
- Pal, Bipin Chandra. The soul of India. [pref. 1923.]
- Sree Krishna. [192-?]]
- Palmer, A. S. Leaves from a word-hunter's note-book. 1876.
- Paris. Musée Guimet. Le Musée Guimet (1918-1927). 1928. (Paris. Musée Guimet. Annales. Bibliothèque de vulgarisation, t. 48.)
- Poebel, A. Babylonian legal and business documents from the time of the first dynasty of Babylon. 1909. (Pennsylvania. University. Babylonian expedition. Ser. A: Cuneiform texts, v. VI, pt. 2.)
- Purāṇas. Bhāgavatapurāṇa. Bhikshugita. A translation of the 23d chapter of the Eknathi Bhagavata by J. E. Abbott. [1928.] (The Poet-saints of Maharashtra, no. 3.)
- Radlov, V. V. Uigurische Sprachdenkmäler. 1928.
- Ramstedt, G. J. Bergtscheremissische Sprachstudien. 1902. (Suomalaisugrilaisen seuran Toimituksia XVII.)
- Rezvi, T. Parsis. 1928.
- Rivet, P. Bibliographie américaniste. 1927.
- Robinson, Mrs. T. A. L. Historical view of the languages and literature of the Slavic nations. 1850.
- Rousselet, L. India and its native princes. . . . Rev. by Lieut.-Col. Buckle. 1876.
- Royal Asiatic society of Gt. Brit. and Ireland. Straits branch, Singapore. Journal, no. 10-14, 16-17. 1883-87.
- Sa'di. The Gulistān. 2d ed. 1880. (Trübner's Oriental series.)
- Śatapatha brāhmaṇa, ed. by W. Caland, v. I. 1926. (The Punjab Sanskrit series, no. 10.)

- Sathe, P. B. The discourses on the Pūrva Mimāṃsā system. 1927.
- Sathyanatha Aiyar, R. History of the Nayaks of Madura. 1924. (The Madras university historical series, II.)
- Sauveur, L. Causeries avec mes élèves. Éd. illustrée. 1875.
- Sayce, A. H. Introduction to the science of language. 1880. 2v.
- Lectures upon the Assyrian language. 1877.
- Schierlitz, E. Die bildlichen Darstellungen der indischen Göttertrinität in der älteren ethnographischen Literatur. 1927.
- Schleicher, A. A compendium of the comparative grammar of the Indo-European, Sanskrit, Greek and Latin languages. Tr. from 3d German ed. by H. Bendall. 1874-77.
- Die deutsche Sprache. 2. verb. und verm. Aufl. 1869.
- Die Formenlehre[!] der kirchenslawischen Sprache. 1852.
- Handbuch der litauischen Sprache. Prag, 1856-57. 2v. in 1.
- Schröder, E. E. W. G. Über die semitischen und nicht indischen Grundlagen der malaiisch-polynesischen Kultur. Buch I. 1927.
- Schwartz, B. A new species of trichostrongylid worm of the genus *Cooperia* from the Philippine Islands. 1928.
- Silvestre de Sacy, A. I. Chrestomathie arabe. 2. éd. 1826-27. 3v. in 4.
- Skinner, J. R. Key to the Hebrew-Egyptian mystery. 1875.
- Stein, M. A. Innermost Asia. 1928. 4v.
- Strangford, P. E. F. W. S. Original letters and papers of the late Viscount Strangford. . . . Ed. by Viscountess Strangford. 1878.
- Strong, H. A. and Meyer, K. Outlines of a history of the German language. 1886.
- Surendranātha Dāsa-Gupta. Hindu mysticism. 1927. (Norman Wait Harris foundation lectures, 1926.)
- Suśīla-Kumāra De. Studies in the history of Sanskrit poetics. v. II. 1925.
- Suzuki, D. T. Essays in Zen Buddhism. (First series.) 1927.
- Sweet, H. A history of English sounds from the earliest period. 1874.
- Tavernier, J. B. Travels in India, tr. by V. Ball. 2d ed., ed. by W. Crooke. 1925. 2v.
- Taylor, I. The alphabet. 1883. 2v.
- Etruscan researches. 1874.
- Thonmi Sambhoṭa. Une grammaire tibétaine du tibétain classique: les śloka grammaticaux de Thonmi Sambhota, tr. par J. Bacot. 1928. (Annales du Musée Guimet. Bibliothèque d'études, t. 37.)
- Thornton, E. The history of the British empire in India. 1841-45. 6v.
- Timayenis, T. T. Modern Greek. 1877.
- Tokyo. Imperial university. Calendar. 1927/28.
- Trench, R. C. English, past and present. 7th ed. 1871.
- Union of the Macedonian political organizations of the U. S. A. and Canada. Balkan Locarno and the Macedonian question. [2d ed.] 1928. (Pro Macedonia, no. 2.)
- Upalekha. Upalekha de kramapāṭha libellus. Recensuit Guil. Pertsch. 1854.
- Vedas. Yajurveda. Vājasaneyisaṃhitā. Vājasaneya-saṃhitā specimen. Ed. A. Weber. 1846-47.

- Vullers, J. A. *Ioannis Augusti Vullers Institutiones linguae persicae*. 1840.
 ——— *Ioannis Augusti Vullers Lexicon persico-latinum etymologicum*.
 1855-64. 2v.
 Wallace, A. R. *The Malay Archipelago*. 1869.
 Wasiljev, J. *Übersicht über die heidnischen Gebräuche, Aberglauben und
 Religion der Wotjaken*. 1902. (*Suomalais-ugrilaisen seuran Toimituksia XVIII.*)
 Weber, A. F. *Indische Streifen*. 1868-79. 3v. in 2.
 Wedgwood, H. *A dictionary of English etymology*. 2d ed. 1872.
 Weston, W. *Mountaineering and exploration in the Japanese Alps*. 1896.
 White, R. G. *Words and their uses*. 1870.
 Whitney, W. D. *Index verborum to the pub. text of the Atharva-veda*. 1881.
 Wichmann, Y. J. *Die tschuwassischen Lehnwörter in den permischen
 Sprachen*. 1903. (*Suomalais-ugrilaisen seuran Toimituksia XXI.*)
 Windisch, W. E. O. *Kurzgefasste irische Grammatik*. 1879.
 Yonge, C. D. *An English-Greek lexicon*. 1870.

On motion the report of the Librarian was accepted.

On motion it was voted to send the thanks of the Society to Yale University for the gift of duplicate volumes to the Society's library.

REPORT OF THE EDITORS OF THE JOURNAL

Professor Max L. Margolis, the senior editor of the JOURNAL, presented the following report for the editors which upon motion was accepted.

The editors beg to report that since our last meeting there have been issued numbers 2, 3 and 4 of volume 48. The first number of volume 49 was sent to the Yale University Press by the printer on March 23, 1929.

MAX L. MARGOLIS,
 FRANKLIN EDGERTON,
Editors.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Corresponding Secretary presented the report of the Executive Committee as printed in the JOURNAL (48. 288 and 323, and 49. 96), and upon motion the actions of the Committee were ratified.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS

The following persons, recommended by the directors, were duly elected corporate members of the Society (the list includes eleven who were elected at a later session) :

Prof. J. Thayer Addison	Mr. Rowland H. C. Hill
Mr. P. L. Ajiz	Mr. Sunder S. Joshi
Mr. Moshe Berkooz	Prof. Carl S. Knopf
Prof. Julius A. Bewer	Prof. Henry W. Luce
Mr. Noah Brody	Prof. Harley F. MacNair
Mr. Ralph M. Chait	Mr. Anthony F. Paura
Miss Helen B. Chapin	Prof. Dryden L. Phelps
Prof. John W. Creighton	Dr. Frank H. Pritchard
Miss Harryet M. D. Culley	Mr. Morris H. Pullin
Mrs. John L. Dearing	Dr. Samuel Rosenblatt
Mr. Herbert J. Devine	Mr. Julius Schwarz
Rev. Martin L. Dolbeer	Prof. Fred N. Scott
Mr. Dows Dunham	Baron A. von Stael-Holstein
Mr. Alvan C. Eastman	Mr. Israel Stiefel
Mr. Henry Field	Dr. Felix Vályi
Pres. Caleb F. Gates	Dr. Meyer Waxman
Mr. Mortimer Graves	Mrs. James S. White
Mr. Michael J. Gruenthaner	Mr. William B. Whitney
Mr. Selig Harris	Mr. Hanan Yarden

[Total: 38]

ELECTION OF HONORARY MEMBERS

Professor WILHELM GEIGER of the University of Munich, having been recommended by the directors, was unanimously elected to honorary membership in the Society.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Professor Torrey, for the Committee on the Nomination of Officers for 1929, presented the Committee's report of nominations for the several offices as follows:

President: Professor A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON, of New York City.

Vice-Presidents: Professor ALBERT TENENCK OLMSTEAD, of Urbana, Ill.;
Professor RAYMOND P. DOUGHERTY, of New Haven; and Dr. EMIL
G. H. KRAELING, of New York City.

Corresponding Secretary: Dr. CHARLES J. OGDEN, of New York City.

Recording Secretary: Dr. LUDLOW S. BULL, of New York City.

Treasurer: Professor JOHN C. ARCHER, of New Haven.

Librarian: Professor ANDREW KEOGH, of New Haven.

Editors of the Journal: Professor MAX L. MARGOLIS, of Philadelphia, and
Professor W. NORMAN BROWN, of Philadelphia.

Directors, to serve for three years: Professor LEROY C. BARRET, of Hartford; Professor WALTER E. CLARK, of Cambridge; and Professor
NATHANIEL P. SCHMIDT, of Ithaca.

The officers thus nominated were duly elected.

PRESIDENT EDGERTON then delivered an address on "The Upanishads: What Do They Seek and Why?" [printed in the JOURNAL 49, 97 ff.].

The session adjourned at 12.45 P. M.

THE SECOND SESSION

The second session was called to order at 2.30 o'clock on Tuesday afternoon in the auditorium of the Fogg Museum, and the reading of papers was immediately begun.

PROFESSOR NATHANIEL J. REICH, of the Dropsie College: High Lights in the Egyptological Department of Cornell University. Remarks by Dr. Bull.

PROFESSOR CHARLES R. LANMAN, of Harvard University: Geldner's Translation of the Rig-veda, with Commentary (vols. 33-34-35 of the Harvard Oriental Series) and Historical and Critical Epilogue (36).

Rudolph Roth's Veda-class of six at Tuebingen in 1874.—Karl Geldner, facile princeps. His main achievements: monumental text-edition of the Avesta, 1886-1895; his 55 years of study, 1873-1928, of the meaning of the Veda; the fruit of this study, his Translation of the Rig-veda, now completed and printed, and his Historical and Critical Epilogue thereto.—These studies have been enthusiastic, untiring, persistent, modest, judicial. His knowledge of native Hindu tradition (both the oldest and the medieval) as to the sense of the Veda, and of the Vedic exegesis of the moderns (both native and Occidental) has, as a whole, never been matched, whether in India or the West, save by that of our great master, Rudolph Roth. Both Roth and Geldner are true heroes in the world of scholarship.

DR. ANANDA K. COOMARASWAMY, of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston: Early Indian Architecture, I. Cities and city-gates. Remarks by Mr. Bishop.

After briefly describing the constituent parts of a city, the gate-house (*dvāra-koṭṭhaka*) is discussed in detail, mainly on the basis of references in Pali literature, and *Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra*, Ch. 21, and the reliefs of Bharhut, Sāñci, and Amarāvati. There were always four such gate-houses, situated in the middle of the rampart on each of the four sides of the city. The moat is crossed by a bridge or causeway, then, passing between the towers (*dvāraṭṭāla*), under the arch (*torāṇa*), through the great folding doors if they are open, and if not, through the *cūla-dvāra* or *aṇi-dvāra* opening in one of them, the traveller enters the main hall (*śālā*) of the gateway. This hall is roofed by the second story (*ardha-tāla*) of the whole structure, of which the aforesaid towers are a projecting part; above the second story is a third or roof apartment (*uttamāgāra*). On the ground floor (*ādītāla*) the traveller who has passed through the gate-hall, is taken

to the *simāgrha* or *śulka-śālā* where octroi is levied, and he is then free to proceed along one of the *caturmahāpatha* into the city itself.

Baron A. VON STAEL-HOLSTEIN, of the Harvard-Yenching Institute: On a Lamaistic Pantheon recently discovered in the Forbidden City of Peking.

Professor DAVID G. LYON, of Harvard University: The Excavations at Nuzi, conducted by Harvard University and the American School of Oriental Research at Bagdad. Remarks by Dr. Bull and Mr. Bishop.

A brief account of the work in 1927-1929, with views of the trenches, architectural plans, and a description of some of the more important objects found.

Professor E. A. SPEISER, of the University of Pennsylvania: Mesopotamian origins. Remarks by Dr. Uhl and Mr. Bishop.

Dr. NICHOLAS N. MARTINOVITCH, of Columbia University: A new classification of the Turkish peoples and dialects.

Many such schemes of classification have been made by Orientalists, but these have been in contradiction one with another. This paper is an attempt to combine the current theories and to indicate the geographical and historical distribution of all the Turkish dialects and peoples, old and modern. A map-slide will be shown.

The session adjourned at 4.57 P. M.

THE THIRD SESSION

The third session consisted of separate Indological and Semitic sections, both of which were called to order in Phillips Brooks House at 9.35 o'clock Wednesday morning. The reading of papers was immediately begun.

THE INDOLOGICAL SECTION

Professor LEROY C. BARRET, of Trinity College: *Pāippalāda* and *Śāunaka* Book Five. Remarks by Professor Edgerton.

All but three of the hymns of Ś Book Five appear in the first fifteen books of *Pāipp*. Comparison of these hymns as they appear in the two *saṃhitās* gives some reason for concluding that the *Pāipp* forms are usually closer to the ultimate source from which the hymns must have been derived. If such a conclusion should be established for all hymns given by both *saṃhitās* it would be added evidence for the view that the *Pāipp saṃhitā* is older than the *Śāunaka*.

Professor FRANKLIN EDGEERTON, of Yale University: The Present Status of the Vedic Variants. Remarks by Dr. Ogden and Professors Brown, Clark, and Barret.

Professor CHARLES R. LANMAN, of Harvard University: Some characteristics desirable for a beginner's manual of Sanskrit. Remarks by Professor Jackson.

It should consist of two Parts, wholly separate, but bound between one pair of covers: Part 1, the "Grammar," and Part 2, the "Comment."

The "Grammar" should give the essentials as to sounds and sound-changes and inflection, and in the shortest and clearest and least technical form that patient ingenuity can invent. Its compass should be very moderate,—say 50 royal 8vo pages. These should be so large that all the noun-inflections can be shown at three openings (6 pages, each pair vis-à-vis), so as to make clear at a glance the differences, and no less the similarities. Verb-inflection, in like manner. Endless pains should be taken with the examples.

The "Comment" should give ample material illustrating the linguistic facts of Sanskrit by similar phenomena observable, first and foremost, in our native English, but also in Greek and Latin. So, for instance, the phonetics of *Satz-sandhi*, as in "Tom 'z a peach and Jack 's another."

Professor E. H. STURTEVANT, of Yale University: Neuter Pronouns referring to words of Different Gender or Number. Remarks by Professor Edgerton.

Many of the Indo-European languages use neuter pronouns to refer to masculine or feminine antecedents and also to plural antecedents. The usage is particularly common in Italic, Germanic, and Slavic, but it is found also in Celtic, Greek and Indo-Iranian. It must date from Indo-European times. In Hittite neuter singular pronouns often refer to plural antecedents, whether these denote persons or things. This feature of the Indo-European idiom must therefore have originated in Pre-Indo-European.

Professor WALTER E. CLARK, of Harvard University: Comments on Rosenberg's 'Die Probleme der buddhistischen Philosophie.' Remarks by Professor Edgerton, Baron von Stael-Holstein, Professors Archer, Brown, and Joshi, Dr. Uhl and Professor Lanman.

Professor S. L. JOSHI, of Dartmouth College: The *Anatta* Doctrine in Buddhism. Remarks by Professors Clark and Edgerton.

The relation of the central thoughts of the Upanishads to early Buddhism, with special reference to personality and Karma. The Buddhist analysis of personality and modification in the concept of Karma. Is there a permanent self? Does the concept of Nirvana help to answer this question? Parinirvana is certainly opposed to the idea of personal immortality. Is the Buddhist doctrine regarding personality negative or positive? Rhys Davids holds there is no re-incarnating ego. But belief in re-incarnation is clearly emphasized. Dr. Oldenberg's opinion—that the Buddha did not believe in the existence of the ego—is a misconception. The dialogue between

Yamaka and Sariputta misinterpreted by H. C. Warren as a denial of the ego. Buddha himself admits that the Dharma he has discovered by self-culture is the ancient Aryan path—the eternal Dharma. Buddha's real meaning is the transcendental reality of this ego, and not the individual or separate self. There is fundamentally no departure from the Upanishad doctrine of the Atman. The Buddhist Atta and the Upanishadic Atman are identical. Both represent always the subject—never the object. Buddhist ethics must therefore be interpreted in the light of the Upanishad metaphysics in order to arrive at a true estimate of the Anatta doctrine.

Rev. Dr. LEMON L. UHL, of Boston, Mass.: Further Personality Materials of the Telugus for ages preceding 1000 B. C.

Language records: Previous study, presented at Washington, D. C., revealed the development of this people regarding Deity and regarding Time. A more deliberate study of 6,000 of the 40,000 words of this Telugu gives a list of 1,500 words markedly indicative of the reaction of the people to inward experiences and outward observations. These 1,500 lend themselves to classification into 27 groups. This paper deals with the nature of the groups and the number of words in each group. Another paper, it is hoped, will include a study of the remaining 34,000 words. The whole will outline, for one set of our race, the development and its processes in the speech and the mental features of personality.

The section adjourned at 12.40 P. M.

THE SEMITIC SECTION

Dr. HIRSCH L. GORDON, of Newark, N. J.: The Talmudical Literature in Translation. Remarks by Professors Montgomery and Margolis.

The hope of Rabbi Judah b. Shalom expressed sixteen hundred years ago, that the Mishnah will never be translated into a foreign tongue and will thus retain its "mysteries" as Israel's sole heritage (*Pesiqta Rabbati*, V, 1), has thus far been realized. The Mishnah and parts of the Palestinian and Babylonian Gemaras have repeatedly been rendered into Latin and several modern languages, but the Talmud remained, nevertheless, a closed book, because the translations are either too literal and thus unintelligible, or arbitrarily paraphrased, extended or abridged and thus unreliable. Dr. Gordon suggests a new translation procedure that would render the Talmud both lucid and accurate.

Professor FERRIS J. STEPHENS, of Yale University: Did the Early Semites of Asia Minor use the Alphabet? Remarks by Dr. Bull and by Professors Reich, Torrey, Speiser and Dougherty.

The cuneiform tablets from Cappadocia furnish indirect evidence that the Semitic merchants who lived in that region in the latter

half of the third millennium B. C. made use of another system of writing, written upon perishable material.

Professor MAX L. MARGOLIS, of the Dropsie College: Hebrew 'Closed' Syllables. Remarks by Professors Torrey and Speiser.

Professor R. P. DOUGHERTY, of Yale University: Cuneiform References to Punt and Yemen. Remarks by President Morgenstern, Professors Montgomery, Stephens, and Speiser, and Dr. Bull.

There are evidences which suggest that the geographical terms Punt and Yemen were represented by *Pātu* and *Iāmanu* in cuneiform inscriptions.

Professor DAVID G. LYON, of Harvard University: Cuneiform Tablets from Nuzi. Remarks by Professors Speiser and Dougherty.

A description of the tablets, a general account of their contents, and notes on special features.

Professor CHARLES C. TORREY, of Yale University: A Palestinian Aramaic Idiom in the Fourth Gospel. Remarks by Professor Zeitlin, Dr. Bull, and Professor Montgomery.

In the popular narrative of the Jews of Palestine at the beginning of the present era the modest avoidance of the use of the pronoun of the first person singular is sometimes very noticeable, going even beyond what is customary in the usage of other peoples. The Fourth Gospel appears to contain several examples of the kind, including one of more than usual interest.

Professor JAMES A. MONTGOMERY, of the University of Pennsylvania: Ethiopic Texts of Acts of the Apostles. Remarks by Professor Torrey.

A study of the Ethiopic MS, Bibliothèque Nationale, eth. 26 (Zotenberg 42), of Acts in connection with Ropes' *Text* of Acts. The MS, of the 15th century, is preserved only in part. The text is of the 'Mixed' or Antiochian type, with close affinities to the Syriac and Sahidic. The study includes comparison with the texts in the London Polyglot and Platt's Ethiopic New Testament. The former is a text revised after the Vulgate by its original editors in Rome, the latter after the Arabic version.

The section adjourned at 12.30 P. M.

THE FOURTH SESSION

The fourth session was called to order at 2.38 o'clock Wednesday afternoon in the auditorium of the Fogg Museum, and the reading of papers was immediately begun.

Professor WILLIAM HUNG, of Harvard-Yenching Institute: The Discovery of the Nestorian Tablet.

The purpose of this paper is to reopen some of the conclusions reached by Father Henri Havret in his book, "*La stèle chrestienne de Si-ngan-fou*", 3 parts, Shanghai 1895-1902, on the place, the date and the circumstances of the discovery of the tablet. The place of the discovery should be Chang-an near to where the tablet was set up after the discovery. That the discovery was occasioned by the digging of a grave is more plausible than the other account. How Chou-chih came into the confusion. This affects somewhat the dates.

Professor FRANK GAVIN, of the General Theological Seminary, New York: Rabbinic Parallels in Early Church Orders. Remarks by Professor Edgerton.

The inter-action between Judaism and early Christianity did not come to an end with the parting of the ways between the two religions. They influenced each other, directly and indirectly, in many ways, as is illustrated in the case of Judaism: by the substitution of other versions of the O. T. for the LXX, by the disuse of the Ten Commandments in the Synagogue Liturgy, and the change in the rite of ordination. Within Christianity the inter-relation is apparent in the rite of Baptism, the rubrics of the early Church Orders, and the observances connected with the Agape and Eucharist.

Professor LEWIS HODOUS, of the Hartford Seminary Foundation: The Introduction of Buddhism into China. Remarks by Mr. Gardner, Professor Rudd, Drs. Duyvendak, Laufer, and Shryock.

The dream of Ming Ti and the subsequent embassy to India, which brought Buddhist monks and sutras to China, are the usual explanations for the introduction of Buddhism into China. A study of the sources reveals that Buddhism was already established in the Yangtze basin when the dream is believed to have taken place. Its early progress was slow, but the break-up of the Han dynasty, the disruption of China into warring states, the conversion of the Toba Tartars and the union with the Taoists gave it for a time the first place in the cultural life of the Chinese.

Professor A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON, of Columbia University: Allusions to Mānī's fame as a painter.

The allusions have been drawn from Syriac, Arabic, Persian and other sources. Attention is called likewise to the illuminations and handsome handwriting in the fragments of Manichaean manuscripts and the remains of mural paintings discovered at Turfan, in Central Asia. A reference in a Turfan Pahlavi Fragment (M. 47) appears to bear out the traditional interest of the Manichaeans in pictures and calligraphy.

Professor CHARLES C. TORREY, of Yale University: The End of the 'Molech' Cult in Israel.

It is held by the great majority of interpreters of the Old Testament and historians of the Hebrew kingdoms that the cult of Molech

(Melek), which seems to have been introduced by Manasseh and was thoroughly extirpated by Josiah, was soon revived and flourished under Jehoiakim and his successors. This belief is the result of a mistaken view of certain passages in Jeremiah and of the prophecies of Ezekiel.

President JULIAN MORGENSTERN, of the Hebrew Union College: *The Historical Background of Deuteronomic Historiography*. Remarks by Professors Torrey and Montgomery.

It is a generally accepted fact among Biblical scholars that the Book of Judges represents one or more older strata set in a late Deuteronomic framework, that a Deuteronomic stratum runs through both Books of Samuel, and that Kings is a Deuteronomic writing, even though it does obviously contain extracts from older writings. The aim of this study is to determine the actual historical background of this Deuteronomic historiography, the time and place of its composition and the purpose which the peculiar interpretation which it gives to the history of Israel was intended to serve.

Dr. BERTHOLD LAUFER, of the Field Museum, Chicago: *A Chinese-Hebrew manuscript, a new source for the history of the Chinese Jews*. Remarks by Mr. Goodrich and Professor Edgerton.

Dr. K. H. KIANG, of Nan Fang University: *Chinese Philosophy as a Remedy for the Defects of Western Civilization*. Remarks by Professor Lanman.

Professor SOLOMON ZEITLIN, of the Dropsie College: *The Jewish Calendar from the Biblical Period up to the Fourth Century C. E.* Remarks by President Morgenstern.

The calendar which was used in the Bible was a solar one. The year began in the Spring (Nisan), and was divided into twelve months—thirty days each. To have not only Saturday fall on the seventh day, on which God rested, but also to have the first day of Passover and Pentecost fall on Sunday, four days were added every year, which made the year 364 days. Since the year was short one day, after every seven Sabbatical cycles 49 days were added between the Day of Atonement and Succoth, which were called "Jubilee Year", and considered a blank year. Due to the imperfection of this calendar, and due to some other causes, after the return of the Jews from Babylon the calendar was changed to a lunar one. The year began in the Fall (Tishri), and was divided into twelve months—six of 30 days and six of 29, which made the year 354 days. Since this year was short $11\frac{1}{4}$ days, three months of 30 days were intercalated every eight years—on the 2nd, 4th and 6th year of the Sabbatical cycle, so that the Passover would fall after the vernal equinox, leaving the Sabbath in the same hebdomadal order as at the time of the creation of the world. Consequently the Jubilee year disappeared entirely. In the fourth century C. E. the Jewish calendar was

in some ways modified. There were introduced seven intercalated months in every 19 years and also days were fixed on which some of the holidays could not fall.

The session adjourned at 5.57 P. M.

THE FIFTH SESSION

The fifth session was called to order at 9.37 o'clock on Thursday morning, in Phillips Brooks House.

It was announced that the directors had decided to hold the next meeting at Toronto, Canada, in Easter Week 1930, this to be a joint meeting with the Middle West Branch of the Society. In the absence of the Chairman, Dr. Sheldon H. Blank of the Hebrew Union College, the Corresponding Secretary reported for the Committee on Enlargement of Membership and Resources.

Professor Dougherty, of Yale University, reported for the Committee on the Library of Ancient Semitic Inscriptions.

In the absence of Professor Bender, of Princeton University, the Corresponding Secretary reported for the Committee on an American School of Indo-Iranian Research.

Professor Speiser, of the University of Pennsylvania, reported on the American Schools of Oriental Research.

Mr. Bishop, of the Freer Gallery of Art, reported for the delegates to the American Council of Learned Societies. Mr. Bishop had been appointed a delegate to take the place of Prof. Gottheil, of Columbia University, who had been unable to attend the meeting of the Council.

Professor Speiser reported for the delegates to the Seventeenth Congress of Orientalists at Oxford, held in the summer of 1928. He announced that the next Congress was to be held at Leiden in 1931.

The Corresponding Secretary read a report from Professor W. N. Brown, of the University of Pennsylvania, as delegate to the Fifth All-India Oriental Conference.

The President appointed as a Committee on Arrangements for the next annual meeting Professors Irwin, Meek, and W. R. Taylor, and the Corresponding Secretary *ex officio*.

As a Committee on the Nomination of Officers for the year 1930

he appointed Professors Montgomery and Michelson, and Mr. Bishop.

As Auditors he appointed Professors Dougherty and Latourette.

AMENDMENTS TO BY-LAWS

On motion it was unanimously voted to amend By-Laws VII and VIII of the Society to read as follows :

VII. Every member shall be entitled to one copy of all current numbers of the JOURNAL issued during his membership, provided that he has paid his annual assessment for the previous year. Back volumes of the JOURNAL shall be furnished to members in regular standing at twenty per cent reduction from the list price. All other publications of the Society may be furnished to members at such reductions in price as the Directors may determine.

VIII. Candidates for corporate membership who have been elected shall qualify as members by payment of the first annual assessment within one month from the time when notice of such election is mailed to them, or, in the case of persons not residing in the United States, within a reasonable time. A failure so to qualify, unless explained to the satisfaction of the Executive Committee, shall entitle the Committee to annul the election. If any corporate member shall for two years fail to pay his assessments, his name may, after formal notification, be dropped from the list of members of the Society at the discretion of the Executive Committee.

The President announced that Mrs. A. S. DeWitt, the daughter of the late Professor Maurice Bloomfield, had presented to the Society a collection of letters to her father from distinguished scholars at home and abroad.

On motion it was voted unanimously to extend to Mrs. DeWitt the hearty thanks of the Society for this valuable and interesting gift.

The following minute was unanimously adopted :

The American Oriental Society desires to express its hearty appreciation of the cordial hospitality which it has received from Harvard University in giving the use of its buildings, and from Professor Jewett in providing the delightful luncheon. It is also deeply indebted to the other members of the local committee; to Professor Clark for his supervision of the arrangements, to Professor Porter for obtaining so many papers on Sinology, and to Professor Lanman for imparting a special distinction to the sessions by his attendance and participation. Our members present feel that this has been a very successful and enjoyable meeting.

The reading of papers on Far Eastern subjects was then begun.

Professor K. S. LATOURETTE, of Yale University: Occidental Studies on Far Eastern History, 1921-1929. Remarks by Professor Edgerton and Dr. Ogden.

The purpose of this paper is to describe the progress which has been made in Europe and America in the historical study of China and Chinese culture in the past eight years, or, namely, since a similar survey was made by the author for the *American Historical Review* in 1921. The paper will give not only titles and brief appraisals of individual books, but will attempt to point out tendencies, encouraging steps which have been taken, discoveries which have been made, and unsolved problems immediately before us.

Mr. BENJAMIN MARCH, of the Detroit Institute of Arts: A Short Note on Chinese Portraiture. Remarks by Mr. Gardner.

Portraiture is one of the oldest forms of painting in China and very exact rules have been developed to guide artists in their work. Chinese painters have not made use of light and shade and the modeling which is characteristic of European portraits. Nevertheless they are extraordinarily accurate, as is shown by the fact that a portrait painted by Wu Tao-tzu, more than a thousand years after Confucius's death, revealed the character of Confucius so clearly that the leading psycho-analyst of Detroit, more than a thousand years after the picture was painted, was able from it perfectly to reconstruct the character of the original subject without knowing his identity.

Dr. JOHN K. SHEYOCK, of the University of Pennsylvania: The Cult of Confucius and His Disciples. Remarks by Professors Harvey and Hail, Drs. Duyvendak, Kiang, and Bull, and Mr. Mei.

A historical study of the development of the cult and of those who have been honored by having their names placed in the state temples, based mainly on the official temple records.

Dr. J. J. L. DUYVENDAK, of the University of Leiden and Columbia University: Hsün-tzū and the School of Law. Remarks by Professors Gale and Gardner.

Mr. K. T. MEI, of Harvard University: The Influence of Confucius on Chinese Historiography. Remarks by Dr. Duyvendak.

Miss NANCY LEE SWANN, of the Gest Chinese Research Library, Montreal: Excerpts from and problems in a study of the life and writings of Pan Chao.

Pan Chao 班昭 [Ts'ao Ta Ku 曹大家 of the court of the Eastern Han emperor Ho 和帝 (89-105 A. D.)] belongs unquestionably in the most select group of China's learned ones. Whether she be regarded as a historian, or as a moralist, or as a writer of varied literary talent, even at this great distance in time she stands forth, alike in private life and in letters, a remarkable representative of Chinese womanhood. Although a gratifying number of her works

has been transmitted through these eighteen centuries, it is to these nevertheless comparatively few extant works alone that modern literary criticism needs must be confined.

The unsolved problems in a study of the life and writings of this woman may be grouped under four headings: (1) the genuineness of the primary sources; (2) the use of an epitaph preserved only in translation; (3) the paucity of facts; and (4) the trustworthiness of a modern historical narrative of the *Han* periods for dates of *Pan Chao's* birth and death.

Mr. JOHN REILLY, JR., of the American Numismatic Society, New York: Chinese Material in the Museum of the American Numismatic Society. Remarks by Professor Hail, Dr. Uhl, and Messrs. Bishop and Wood.

Professor ESSON M. GALE, of the University of California: The Public Administration of Salt in China: Origins in the Western Han Dynasty—a preliminary study. Remarks by Drs. Duyvendak and Laufer.

Hitherto the significant rôle of salt in Chinese politico-economic history has not been systematically exposed. Notices of remoter antiquity indicate early trend towards government monopoly. Definitive system of official control and exploitation grew largely from fiscal exigencies arising from Han Wu Ti's military expansionist policies (140-86 B. C.): 1) underlying determinative forces, 2) definition and description of public administration of salt, 3) abandonment under doctrinaire Confucianist opposition; resumption for state reasons. Incorporation into Wang Mang's (9-23 A. D.) socialistic regime; but while socialism lapses, salt retains lasting vitality as a specific factor in Chinese public finance.

Mr. ARTHUR W. HUMMEL, of the Library of Congress: Early Chinese Gazeteers.

The following papers were read by title:

Professor GEORGE A. BARTON, of the University of Pennsylvania: Whence came the Sumerians?

The theory that the Sumerians came from Elam is untenable, since their pottery, their script, and their language differ from those of early Elam. We cannot think of them as coming from the North, since their pottery is unlike that traceable in the North. The red ware found at Eridu and El-Ubaid, which resembles northern pottery, must be held to be pre-Sumerian. The dress of the Sumerians as well as the fact that, when performing priestly functions, they were nude, indicates that they came from a warm climate—from the South. Their sacred island, Dilmun, was in the south. There is no reason to connect their homeland with India. The Harrappa and Mohenjo-dara inscriptions are not Sumerian. Possibly they came from eastern Oman; a missionary reports the existence of a non-Arabic people in the mountains there, who still worship in an unknown tongue. At all events, an archaeological

survey should be made of both shores of the Persian Gulf, to see if definite traces of the pre-Babylonian habitat of the Sumerians cannot be found.

Professor E. A. SPEISER, of the University of Pennsylvania: (a) A Letter of Saushshatar, king of the Mitanni; (b) On the name *Bildad*.

(a) The date of the important Kirkuk Tablets was until recently a matter for conjectures. The Harvard-Baghdad School Expedition to Nuzi discovered last year, among others, a letter from Saushshatar, the first known king of the Mitanni, addressed to a local nobleman. Since Saushshatar reigned about 1500 B. C., the date of the Kirkuk tablets may now be placed definitely at the same time. The letter names also the father of Saushshatar, thus adding a new Indo-European name to the list of the Mitanni rulers.

(b) The name Bil-Adad, which occurs in the Nuzi Tablets, is obviously the cuneiform model for the biblical name *Bildad*. Bil-Adad developed undoubtedly from Apil-Adad, 'Heir of Adad.'

Professor ROBERT J. KELLOGG, of Ottawa (Kans.) University: (a) Historical and cultural background of Hittite Indo-Europeanity; (b) The Indo-European name of the Hittites.

(a) (I.) Archaeological remains and excavation of Hittite sites show a wide spread of Hittite culture and power extending back into the Fourth Millennium. (II.) Presumptive historical, cultural and military continuity shown by (1) historical evidence, (2) geographical considerations, (3) military roads, (4) Hittite monuments, (5) continuity of Hittite art and culture, and their priority to those of Kerkuk and Assyria, (6) spread of the Hittite name. (III.) Ethnical continuity shown by (1) monumental types, and (2) relation to allied stocks. (This does not preclude the possibility of invasion and racial mixture.) (IV.) Presumptive linguistic continuity of IE Hittite shown by (1) the IE Hittite name, (2) relationship to Lydian, Lycian, etc. in accord with former border contacts, (3) historic location and early IE contacts agreeing with IE relationships. (The continuity of IE Hittite speech would not preclude the presence of other languages, nor the possibility of language mixture in Hittite itself.)

(b) (I.) The successive names *Buršaḫanda*, *Buruḫanda*, *Buruḫatim*, *Ḥatim*, *Ḥatti*, are identified with each other by the Hittite version of the Inscription of Naram-Sin.—Their phonetic continuity is shown by the regular development in IE Hittite of *-nd->-dd-* (*-tt-*). (The form *Ḥatim* is Cappadocian, which rejected gemination.) (II.) This creates the presumption that the name was either itself IE or was adopted by the Hittites at a very early period. In either event, it argues strongly for the identity of the *Buršaḫanda* with which Sargon of Accad fought, with the later IE *Ḥatti*. (III.) This conclusion is borne out by the historical circumstances of the campaigns of Sargon and Naram-Sin, (2) the later struggles culminating in the Hittite conquest of Babylon, (3) the well-known relations of *Ḥat-*

tušas to Kanesh, and (4) archaeological evidence showing the backward reach of Hittite power, culture, and ethnographic type to the Fourth Millennium.

Dr. ISRAEL EFROS, of Buffalo, N. Y.: Some Textual Notes on the Hebrew Bible.

Professor WILLIAM ROSENAU, of the Johns Hopkins University: The Song of Judith (Judith 16: 1-17).

This song is undoubtedly not a part of the original narrative. It was written perhaps by someone who, like the author of the "Song of Deborah" (Judges 5), felt prompted to memorialize in verse the victory of an illustrious heroine. Both the OT and Apocryphal songs mentioned reveal striking resemblance in thought and spirit. The phraseology of the "Song of Judith" consists for the most part of OT passages either in their original or in modified form. Among the devotional literary remains abundant in the Apocrypha, the "Song of Judith" may be said to take first rank for the sounding of the OT keynote.

Professor E. WASHBURN HOPKINS, of Yale University: *rté śrāntāsya* (RV. iv. 33. 11).

In this passage (*ná rté śrāntāsya sakhyāya devāḥ*) the phrase *rté śrāntāsya* is regarded by Sāyaṇa, Roth, Geldner, Ludwig, and Grassmann (in his translation) as meaning "without toil." Grassmann's Lexicon, however, makes *rté* locative of the noun. The abnormal syntax (*rté* elsewhere governs the ablative) is shocking, and since it is unnecessary it should be repudiated. The sentiment remains the same, embodying the moral of vs. 9, *āpo hy eṣām ājuṣanta devāḥ*, "the gods were indeed pleased with their work." So here, "the gods are not (disposed) to friendship at the rite of a man who gets tired," that is, one who quits working. Or we may suppose that the original was *áśrāntāsya* (the *á* then lost after *rté*, with accent shifted), in the more usual sense of "one who does not toil." Any explanation is better than to make *rté* govern the genitive, though there is no objection to taking *śrāntā* as a noun, as does Sāyaṇa.

Professor ROBERT J. KELLOGG, of Ottawa (Kans.) University: Primitive Indo-European Traits in Hittite.

(I.) The basic IE element in Hittite includes many primitive traits in vocabulary, phonology and structure, as *esmi* "I am", *esun* "I was", *esta* (= *est*) "he was", *karp-* "pick up", *luk-* "shine, burn", *siptamas* "seventh", *kardi* "heart", etc. (II.) The Verb System fundamentally is pre-IE in (1) non-temporal, root-determinative stem-formations, (2) two-tense system which combines freely with root-determinative stems in the creation of the forms of any particular verb, (3) pre-subjunctive modal system. (III.) Noun System shows Primitive and Pre-IE traits in (1) two-gender system, (2) full retention of the heteroclitic *-n/r-* declension, (3) orderly use

of *-u/m-* suffixes, and possibly also in (4) partial identity of singular and plural endings, (5) inflectional similarity between declensions, (6) survival of agglutinative case suffixes. (IV.) Retention of Primitive IE and Pre-IE traits implies (1) early differentiation of Hittite from other IE groups, and (2) extreme phonetic and structural conservatism.—It does not preclude (3) possibility of a similar early differentiation or separation of other IE or near-IE stocks, nor (4) special resemblances of Hittite to other IE groups.—It leaves open (5) several possibilities as to form of Hittite-IE relationship.

Professor JOHN H. REISNER, of the University of Nanking and Columbia University: Making available Old Chinese Literature relating to Agriculture.

Rev. Dr. JUSTIN E. ABBOTT, of Summit, N. J.: 'A Garland of Prayers,' being a translation of a selection of Prayers of the Poet-saints of Mahārāshtra, from Dnyānadev (c. 1290) to Mahipati (c. 1770).

This work, which I have entitled *Stotramālā*, contains my selection of Prayers of the Poet-saints of Mahārāshtra, Dnyānadev (c. 1290), Nāmdēv, Bhānudās, Eknāth, Tukārām, Rāmdās, Dinkar, Keshav, Krishnadās, Tryambak, Devadās, Moropant, Govindā, and Mahipati (c. 1770).

Professor FRANK R. BLAKE, of the Johns Hopkins University: (a) The various methods of expressing adverbial ideas in Semitic; (b) Adverbial expressions of time in Syriac; (c) The particle *i* in the Philippine languages.

(a) The topic of adverbial ideas is not satisfactorily treated in any grammar; the treatment being usually confined to a discussion of those adverbs which have special adverbial form. Adverbial ideas in Semitic may be expressed: (a) by particles, Arab. *lā* not, Heb. *gam* also; (b) by accusative case of noun, Arab. *qalīlan* a little; (c) by absolute state of noun, Heb. *hāyiom* today; (d) by prepos. phrases, Syr. *ba-gal* soon; (e) by special ending, Syriac *-a'ith*, Assy. *iš*; (f) by verbs, Heb. *yaiiāšob yaiiāhpōr* 'he dug again.' The use of these different methods of expression by the various Semitic languages will be discussed.

(b) No special morphological device is employed in Syriac to denote these expressions. They must therefore be studied from the point of view of meaning. Adverbial expressions of time are indefinite e. g., 'now', 'afterward', etc., or definite like 'today', 'last year', etc. The definite expressions refer to present, past, or future time, and also to continuing or recurring time. The same subdivisions may be made for the most part in the case of the indefinite expressions. The present paper deals with the various methods used by Syriac in rendering these various categories.

(c) This particle has a variety of meanings in the various idioms, viz: (a) pronominal particle, e. g., Ibanag article *i*; (b) local prefix to nouns and pronouns as e. g., in the tribal names *Iloko*, *Igorot*, etc.;

Professor GEORGE C. O. HAAS, of the International School of Vedic and Allied Research: The complex constitution of the human body according to the Upanishads.

This paper consists of a synopsis of over 550 annotated similes from the principal Upaniṣads, including also the major metaphors, together with classified indexes of the figures and the philosophic ideas which they try to convey.

This paper forms the conclusion to the article that appeared in the JOURNAL, Vol. 48, pp. 225-249.

In 11:15a read *li-didāṭī* following **G** instead of **M** *li-didi*; and *ham-mēzimm(ō)ṭ* [], vices, for *ham-mēzimāṭā*. In 15b read [ha]-*ḥarāḇīm*, sheep, for *hā-rabbīm*, the multitude (cf. Arab. *harāfun*, sheep; as to *f* and *b* cf. Arab. *nāsafa*, he blew, and Heb. *našāḇ*, he blew). For the idea of sheep meaning sacrifices cf. **G** *μὴ εὐχαι* and **L** *adipes*, ad loc., *bēsar-qōḏēš*, holy flesh, being an explanatory gloss for *hā-ḥarāḇīm*. Read *ṣarab(ī)rā*, they will remove, instead of *ṣarabrū*, they pass way; *mēālūṭīk*, from upon thee, is a prosaic gloss.

Why is my beloved at my home (after) she has committed (all) vices?

so that thou mayest rejoyce?

Dr. BARUCH WEITZEL, of Philadelphia, Pa.: A Catalogue of the South Arabian Inscriptions in the *Corpus*.

Mr. ISRAEL STIEFEL, of Philadelphia, Pa.: A juristic view about the (Aramaic and Demotic) Papyri from Elephantine.

The Society adjourned at 12.30 p. m. to meet at Toronto during Easter Week, 1930.

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
MIDDLE WEST BRANCH
OF THE
American Oriental Society

AT THE MEETING IN INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA,
DECEMBER 28-29, 1928

The sessions of the thirteenth annual meeting of the Middle West Branch were held in Indianapolis, Indiana, at the Lincoln and Claypool Hotels, Friday and Saturday, December 28 and 29, 1928. This meeting served as the 1929 meeting of the Branch and was held concurrently with the meeting of the American Historical Association.

The following members were present at one or more of the sessions :

Braden	Kellogg, R. J.	Price
Breasted	Kelso, J. L.	Sellers
Buckler	Lybyer	Smith, J. M. P.
Debevoise	McGovern	Williams, Mrs. C. R.
Feuerlicht	Morgenstern	Worrell
Fuller	Nakarai	Zeitlin
Glueck	Olmstead	

There were present also the following candidates for membership in the Society :

Malone	James	Swindler, Miss M.
--------	-------	-------------------

FIRST SESSION

At 10.00 A. M., Friday, the meeting was called to order in the Lincoln Hotel by President Leslie E. Fuller. The chair appointed as a Committee on Resolutions Professors Price, Braden, and Worrell; and as a Committee on Nominations Professors J. M. P. Smith, R. J. Kellogg, and M. Jung. (A telegram from Professor Jung, saying that illness prevented his attendance, was received during the session.)

There followed the reading of papers.

Prof. CHARLES S. BRADEN, of Northwestern University: Twentieth-Century Tendencies in Islam. Remarks by Professors Lybyer, Worrell, Nakarai, and Sellers.

Modern Islam is undergoing great changes. Its different branches vary from extreme fundamentalism to ultra-liberalism. At present the greatest activities are within Islam itself. Some of its missionary activities have been abandoned.

Prof. W. H. WORRELL, of the University of Michigan: A Coptic Birth-Spell. Remarks by Professors Buckler, Lybyer, and Olmstead.

A seventh-century (?) papyrus-text in distorted or dialectic Coptic, translated from Greek, in which heavenly powers are summoned (not asked) to assist in the birth of a child by cleaving the mother's right side.

Prof. WILLIAM C. GRAHAM, of the University of Chicago (read by Professor Smith): Notes on the Interpretation of Isaiah 5. 1-14. Remarks by Professors Worrell and Sellers.

In the "Song of the Vineyard" Isaiah is quoting from a part of the ritual of the fertility cult, which he then proceeds to hold up to scorn. This view is borne out by a study of the philology and the thought of the passage.

Prof. IRA M. PRICE, of the University of Chicago: Use of the Imperative in Sumerian. Remarks by Professors Worrell and Kellogg.

The age of Gudea is our foraging ground. The root-form alone originally had an imperative force, the same being indicated by the tone of voice. When the language was written, prefixes or suffixes or both marked the imperative sense. Our guide to meaning of such forms is the bilingual text. The suffixes are *e*, *a*, *ab* (*ib*). The most frequent prefix is *u* (*ú*, *û*), with a kind of optative force. The prefix *mun* (*mu-un*), almost nominal in sense, is really a participial construction used imperatively. Modifications of the same are seen in *mu*, *mu-e*, *me*, *mi*, *ma*. To stress the nominal idea we find *u-me*. A peculiar imperative is that of a noun with a regular suffix, translated as an imperative.

SECOND SESSION

The second session was a joint session with the American Historical Association. It was started in Parlor T of the Claypool Hotel, but the attendance was so large that the place of meeting was changed to the Assembly Room. Professor Albert H. Lybyer, of the University of Illinois, was Chairman of this session. Except for the time taken in changing rooms, the session was devoted to the reading of papers.

Prof. J. M. POWIS SMITH, of the University of Chicago: The Unique

Element in Hebrew Thought. Remarks by Professors Sellers, Kellogg, and McGovern.

The idea that Israel was the chosen people of Yahweh is fundamental in the Old Testament. Babylonians, Assyrians, Egyptians, and Moabites held similar views. The world has ceased to take the claims of these older peoples seriously, but the claim of the Hebrews has long been respected and still is respected by many people. The reasons for the difference are: (1) The work of the prophets of Israel in moralizing the religion of Israel and in converting its theory of divine choice from a purely nationalistic dogma into a sense of universal mission of service. (2) The nature of the Old Testament—a selected body of literature. (3) The editorial activity that entered into the compilation and production of the Old Testament. The Hebrew idea of choice, then, is presented for the suffrage of mankind in the most attractive and winning robes.

President JULIAN MORGENSTERN, of Hebrew Union College: The Historical Beginnings of Judaism. Remarks by Professor Fuller.

The aim of this paper is to disprove the generally accepted view, based largely upon the unquestioning acceptance of the traditional New Testament interpretation of Judaism as a religion of legalism and ritualism, that Judaism began with the religious reforms of Ezra and Nehemiah and the introduction of the Priestly Code. Rather the historical beginnings of Judaism must be found in the message first preached by Jeremiah, that the exile was not to be for doom and destruction, but for the correction, discipline, and regeneration of Israel, with a consequent return to Yahwe. This new message brought the old, national religion of Israel to an end and paved the way for Judaism as a universal religion. For it opened up for Israel a new vision, with unending hope, a world-wide horizon, and a persistence unto the end of days, and eventually even into the future world.

Prof. FRANCIS W. BUCKLER, of Oberlin University: The Holy Persian Empire and the Mughal State. Remarks by Professors James and Lybyer.

In 1923, in a paper entitled "A New Interpretation of Akbar's Infallibility Decree of 1579" (JRAS, 1924, pp. 591-608), I suggested that the key to Perso-Mughal diplomatic relations lay in Persia's claim to hegemony both over India and over the Mughals, while the Mughal state claimed independence of both Persia and Turkey. Consequently the house of Timur was forced to rely on Hindu support to counterbalance the efforts of Persia to reassert her suzerainty over them. In this paper this thesis is examined in the light of the relations of the Mughals with Persia and the Hindus from 1579 to 1853, when Bahadur Shah II resigned himself once more to Persian protection.

Prof. SOLOMON ZEITLIN, of Dropsie College: The Jewish Revolution of 65-70, the French Revolution, the Russian Revolution; a Comparative Study. Remarks by President Morgenstern and Professor Fuller.

At 6.00 P. M. there was a joint dinner with the Ancient History Section of the American Historical Association, in the Claypool Hotel. Professor James H. Breasted, of the University of Chicago, was the guest of honor. Professor Evarts B. Greene, of Columbia University, was Chairman. After the dinner Professor Breasted made an informal speech.

At 8.00 P. M. the Branch attended the General Session of the American Historical Association, to hear Professor Breasted's Presidential Address: The New Crusade.

After the address there was a smoker at the Columbia Club.

THIRD SESSION

President Fuller called to order the third session at 10.00 A. M., Saturday, in the Lincoln Hotel. There followed the reading of papers.

Prof. ROBERT J. KELLOGG, of Ottawa University: Some Historical Suggestions and Queries Offered by Hittite Research. Remarks by Professor Price.

Linguistic relationships of IE Hittite and their possible bearing on the question of primitive habitats. Monumental and geographical corroborations. Hittite, Assyrian, Babylonian, and Kanesian writing, culture, and comparative chronology. Hittite and Assyrian Art. Some results of recent excavations.

At 10.30 A. M. President LESLIE E. FULLER gave the Presidential Address: The Form and Occasion of Early Hebrew Prophecy.

The reading of papers was resumed.

Prof. A. T. OLMSTEAD, of the University of Illinois: Notes on Some Assyrian Historians. Remarks by Professors Kellogg and Price.

Some examples showing different degrees of reliability on the part of writers of Assyrian History. Instances of one writer's repeating the mistakes of another. Demonstration of the necessity of the historian's checking up with original sources.

Professor SMITH, Chairman of the Committee on Nominations, placed in nomination the following as officers for the ensuing year:

For President: Mrs. CAROLINE RANSOM WILLIAMS.

For Vice-President: Professor THEOPHILE J. MEEK.

For Secretary-Treasurer: Professor O. R. SELLERS.

For members of the Executive Committee: Professors FULLER and GRAHAM.

These officers were unanimously elected.

It was voted unanimously to hold the next separate meeting of the Branch at Oberlin, Ohio, and to unite in a joint meeting with the Society if the Society decides to hold the 1930 meeting in Toronto.

FOURTH SESSION

The fourth session was called to order by President Fuller at 2.00 P. M.

Professor PRICE, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions, presented the following:

RESOLVED, That the Middle West Branch of the American Oriental Society congratulates itself on the happy arrangement this year of holding its meeting in coöperation with the American Historical Association and on the good fortune in having this meeting at Indianapolis.

That we, the members of the Branch, extend our hearty thanks to our member, Professor A. T. OLMSTEAD, for originating the idea of this meeting, for attending to many details to make it possible, and for making arrangements for both the joint session and the dinner.

That we express our gratitude to Dr. C. B. COLEMAN, Chairman of the American Historical Association Committee on Programs; to Mr. EMMETT A. RICE, Secretary of the Committee on Local Arrangements; to the different committees in Indianapolis who looked after the conveniences of their guests; to Professor NAKARAI for providing the lantern for illustrated papers; and to the managements of the Lincoln and Claypool Hotels for their proficiency and courtesy in all our sessions.

That we thank our officers, particularly the President, for the prompt and efficient conduct of the programs.

That we offer our special thanks to our member, Rabbi FEUERLIGHT, for his splendid kindness and hospitality in inviting the members of the Branch to Sunday dinner at the Broadmoor Country Club.

These resolutions were adopted unanimously. There followed the reading of papers.

Prof. WILLIAM M. MCGOVERN, of Northwestern University: *Some Problems of Asiatic History, in the Light of Buddhist Studies.* Remarks by Professors Kellogg and Sellers.

Prof. ALBERT H. LYBYER, of the University of Illinois: *A Possible Moslem League of Nations.* Remarks by Professors Buckler and McGovern.

Turkey, Persia, and Afghanistan have been widely separated in spirit by differences of religion, language, and history. But within the last seven years they have been forming new ties. Turkey and Afghanistan signed treaties March 1, 1921, and May 25, 1928; Persia and Afghanistan June 2, 1921, and November 28, 1927; Persia and Turkey April 22, 1926, and June 15, 1928. The similar but not identical documents

show progressive increase of confidence and friendly feeling. They promise negative and positive neutrality in case of war with third parties, besides conference as to assistance beyond neutrality. Improvement of communications and close commercial relations are contemplated. Turkey provides Afghanistan with technical advisers. Out of this beginning may develop a Moslem League of Nations.

Mrs. C. RANSOM WILLIAMS, of Toledo, Ohio: A Preliminary Account of a Late Hieratic Papyrus in the Toledo Museum of Art (Illustrated). Remarks by Professors Worrell, Sellers, and Olmstead.

Papyrus of Roman date, probably 2d cent., A. D. The owner's name, Tmesio (T_3ms^3 , cf. $\Theta\mu\sigma\acute{\iota}\omega\varsigma$, Preisigke, *Namenbuch*, 140), is known only in 2d-4th cent. documents (communication of Prof. W. Spiegelberg, also his *Demotische Studien*, I, p. 14, No. 88). The mother's name, Tshirianup ($T_3\acute{s}rit \text{ } ^1Inp$, cf. $\Sigma\epsilon\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\nu\phi\iota\varsigma$, Preisigke, *op. cit.*, 370), "Daughter of Anubis," although having much longer vogue, is written in a way peculiar to Roman period, with the triple lock of hair substituted for the single "lock of youth" as idiogram for $\acute{s}rit$, and in one variant with the entire word-group $\acute{s}ni$ meaning "hair" taking place of the correct ideogram. Length of the papyrus, 11 ft., $7\frac{1}{2}$ in. (m. 3.35); height $9\frac{1}{8}$ in. (m. 0.232). A funerary document of composite character, including vignette of the weighing of the heart from Book of the Dead, but no Book of the Dead texts. Six columns of text, in all 60 lines. Especially interesting are cols. 3-5, liturgical and illustrated with appropriate small vignettes. The deceased is adjured to "take to thyself" "unguent," "clothing," "beer," etc., "from the hands of" "Shesmu," "Tayet," "Menket," divinities associated with the respective necessities named. The authorities of the Toledo Museum wish this papyrus to be known as the "Stevens Papyrus" in honor of the late Director of the Museum, George W. Stevens.

Mr. NEILSON C. DEBEVOISE, of the University of Illinois: Did the Parthians Have an Art? (Illustrated). Remarks by Professor Malone, Mrs. Williams.

The existence of Parthian art has long been denied, but authorities now recognize that this is incorrect. While it has previously been characterized as mixture of Hellenistic and Oriental motives, there is now sufficient evidence to lead us to believe that Assyrian and Sumerian influence were as strong as Hellenistic. That Hellenistic influence had largely disappeared by the beginning of the Christian era is shown by the coinage and the use of Pahlavi thereon, by the art and architecture, and by the restoration of Zoroastrianism, probably in the reign of Vologases (77-146 A. D.).

Prof. O. R. SELLERS, of Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Chicago: Syria and Palestine Last Summer (Illustrated). Remarks by Professors Kelso, Olmstead, Kellogg.

Moving pictures showing differnt kinds of traffic in Beirut; the fire in Damascus June 18, 1928; the excavations at Megiddo and Tell-Beit

Mirsim; digging the foundation for the new museum at Jerusalem; scenes portraying the retention of old customs and the encroachment of the new.

The following papers were read by title:

Prof. SHELDON H. BLANK, of Hebrew Union College: Terms for Law in Old Testament Usage.

Prof. MOSES JUNG, of Hillel Foundation, University of Illinois: The Attitude of Medieval Jewish Philosophers Towards the Rationalistic Interpretation of Biblical Passages.

The Treasurer made the following report:

Deficit reported at the last meeting.....	\$ 6.38
Expenditures	19.16
	<hr/>
	25.54
Received from the Treasurer of the Society.....	6.38
	<hr/>
Deficit	\$19.16

The Secretary was ordered to send letters of thanks to several citizens and organizations in Detroit, who had invited the Branch to hold a meeting there.

The Branch voted unanimously to express to the Directors of the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem the hope that the summer session of the School would not be abandoned.

The meeting adjourned at 4.05 p. m.

A number of the members remained over until Monday to participate in the social functions and sessions of the American Historical Association. Ten members of the Branch accepted the invitation of Rabbi FEUERLICHT for Sunday dinner.

LIST OF MEMBERS

The number placed after the address indicates the year of election.

† Designates members deceased since the annual meeting.

HONORARY MEMBERS

- Prof. THEODOR NÖLDEKE, Ettlingerstr. 53, Karlsruhe, Germany. 1878.
Prof. EDUARD SACHAU, University of Berlin, Germany. (Wormserstr. 12, W.) 1887.
Prof. IGNAZIO GUIDI, University of Rome, Italy. (Via Botteghe Oscure 24.) 1893.
Prof. ARCHIBALD H. SAYCE, University of Oxford, England. 1893.
Prof. ADOLF ERMAN, University of Berlin, Germany. (Peter Lennéstr. 36, Berlin-Dahlem.) 1903.
Sir GEORGE A. GRIERSON, K.C.I.E., Rathfarnham, Camberley, Surrey, England. Corporate Member, 1889; Honorary, 1905.
Prof. EDUARD MEYER, University of Berlin, Germany. (Mommsenstr. 7, Berlin-Lichterfelde.) 1908.
Prof. HERMANN JACOBI, University of Bonn, Germany. (Niebuhrstrasse 59.) 1909.
Prof. C. SNOUCK HURGRONJE, University of Leiden, Netherlands. (Rapenberg 61.) 1914.
Prof. SYLVAIN LÉVI, Collège de France, Paris, France. (9 Rue Guy-de-la-Brosse, Paris, Ve.) 1917.
Prof. ARTHUR ANTHONY MACDONELL, University of Oxford, England. 1918.
FRANÇOIS THUREAU-DANGIN, Membre de l'Institut de France, Musée du Louvre, Paris, France. 1918.
Sir ARTHUR EVANS, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, England. 1919.
Prof. V. SCHEIL, Membre de l'Institut de France, 4bis Rue du Cherche-Midi, Paris, France. 1920.
Prof. FREDERICK W. THOMAS, University of Oxford, England. 1920.
Rév. Père M.-J. LAGRANGE, Ecole archéologique française de Palestine, Jerusalem, Palestine. 1921.
DON LEONE CAETANI, DUCA DI SERMONETA, Villino Caetani, 13 Via Giacomo Medici, Rome 29, Italy. 1922.
Prof. MORIZ WINTERNITZ, German University of Prague, Czechoslovakia. (Prague II, Opatovická 8.) 1923.
Prof. HEINRICH ZIMMERN, University of Leipzig, Germany. (Ritterstr. 16/22.) 1923.
Prof. PAUL PELLLOT, Collège de France, Paris, France. (38 Rue de Varenne, Paris, VIIe.) 1924.
Prof. KURT SETHE, University of Berlin, Germany. (Berlin-Wilmersdorf, Konstanzerstr. 36.) 1927.
Sir JOHN MARSHALL, Kt., C.I.E., Litt.D., Gorton Castle, Simla, India. 1928.

Prof. FLINDERS PETRIE, Kt., D.C.L., University College, London, England. 1928.

Sir AUREL STEIN, Litt.D., c/o Dr. P. S. Allen, Corpus Christi College, Oxford, England. 1928.

Prof. WILHELM GEIGER, München-Neubiberg, Germany. 1929.

[Total: 25]

HONORARY ASSOCIATES

Field Marshal Viscount ALLENBY, G.C.B., G.C.M.G., Naval and Military Club, London, England. 1922.

Hon. CHARLES R. CRANE, 655 Park Ave., New York, N. Y. 1921.

Rev. Dr. OTIS A. GLAZERBROOK, American Consul, Nice, France. 1921.

Pres. FRANK J. GOODNOW, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1921.

Hon. CHARLES EVANS HUGHES, 1020 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y. 1922.

Hon. HENRY MORGENTHAU, 417 Park Ave., New York, N. Y. 1921.

Hon. SAO-KE ALFRED SZE, Chinese Legation, London, England. 1922.

Hon. WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT, Chief Justice, The Supreme Court of the United States, Washington, D. C. 1921.

[Total: 8]

CORPORATE MEMBERS

Names marked with * are those of life members.

MARCUS AARON, 5564 Aylesboro Ave., Pittsburgh, Pa. 1921.

MOSTAFA ABBASSI, Carleton College, Northfield, Minn. 1927.

Rev. Dr. JUSTIN EDWARDS ABBOTT, 120 Hobart Ave., Summit, N. J. 1900.

Prof. JAMES THAYER ADDISON (Episcopal Theol. School), 8 Mercer Circle, Cambridge, Mass. 1929.

*Pres. CYRUS ADLER (Dropsie College), 2041 North Broad St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1884.

Prof. A. WILLIAM AHL, Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove, Pa. 1926.

Prof. S. KEISHNASWAMI AIYANGAR (Univ. of Madras), "Sriyayavasam," 1 East Mada St., Mylapore, Madras, India. 1921.

P. L. AJIZ, M.A., The Modern High School, Allahabad, U. P., India. 1929.

Prof. WILLIAM FOXWELL ALBRIGHT, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1915.

A. YUSUF ALI, M.A., 6 Pall Mall, London, S.W. 1, England. 1928.

Prof. T. GEORGE ALLEN (Univ. of Chicago), 5460 Ridgewood Court, Chicago, Ill. 1917.

Prof. OSWALD T. ALLIS, Westminster Theological Seminary, 1528 Pine St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1916.

NAZMIE H. ANABTAWY, Jaffa, Palestine. 1925.

Prof. A. J. ANBIAN, M.A., Cambridge Institute, Nazareth, S. India. 1928.

THEODORE ANDREWS, 46 East Blackwell St., Dover, N. J. 1928.

Prof. SHIGERU ARAKI, The Peeress' School, Aoyama, Tokyo, Japan. 1915.

Prof. J. C. ARCHER (Yale Univ.), Box 1848, Yale Station, New Haven, Conn. 1916.

Rev. ROBERT C. ARMSTRONG, Ph.D., 85 Asquith Ave., Toronto, Ont., Canada. 1926.

- Prof. K. ASAKAWA, Yale University Library, New Haven, Conn. 1904.
 Mrs. SIMON BACHARACH, 1040 Winding Way, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1928.
 Dean WILLIAM FREDERIC BADÈ (Pacific School of Religion), 2616 College Ave., Berkeley, Calif. 1920.
 Rev. FREDERICK A. BAEPLE, Fortuna, N. Dak. 1926.
 Prof. MOSES BAILEY (Wellesley College), 6 Norfolk Terrace, Wellesley, Mass. 1922.
 CHARLES CHANEY BAKER, 1180 Patio Place, Los Angeles, Calif. 1916.
 Rabbi BERNARD S. BAMBERGER, Fowler Hotel, Lafayette, Ind. 1927.
 LOUIS BAMBERGER, c/o L. Bamberger & Co., Newark, N. J. 1928.
 *Dr. HUBERT BANNING, 17 East 128th St., New York, N. Y. 1915.
 Mrs. EARL H. BARBER, 42 Haven St., Reading, Mass. 1925.
 *PHILIP LEMONT BARBOUR, 191 Indian Road, Piedmont, Calif. 1917.
 Rabbi HENRY BAENSTON, Ph.D., 3515 Main St., Houston, Texas. 1921.
 *Prof. LEROY CARR BARRET, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn. 1903.
 *Prof. GEORGE A. BARTON (Univ. of Pennsylvania), N. E. Cor. 43rd and Spruce Sts., Philadelphia, Pa. 1888.
 Mrs. DANIEL M. BATES, 51 Brattle St., Cambridge, Mass. 1912.
 Prof. MINER SEARLE BATES, University of Nanking, Nanking, China. 1926.
 Prof. LORING W. BATTEN (General Theol. Seminary), 6 Chelsea Square, New York, N. Y. 1894.
 *Prof. HARLAN P. BEACH (Drew Theol. Seminary), 57 Madison Ave., Madison, N. J. 1898.
 Miss VIRGINIA BEADLE, 1 West 67th St., New York, N. Y. 1927.
 Rev. WILLIAM Y. BELL, Ph.D., Gammon Theological Seminary, Atlanta, Ga. 1923.
 Prof. ALFRED R. BELLINGER (Yale Univ.), 234 Fountain St., New Haven, Conn. 1929.
 *Prof. SHRIPAD K. BELVALKAR (Deccan College), Bilvakunja, Bhamburda, Poona, India. 1914.
 *ALBERT FARWELL BEMIS, 40 Central St., Boston, Mass. 1927.
 Prof. HAROLD H. BENDER, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1906.
 Rev. CHARLES D. BENJAMIN, Ph.D., Somerton, Philadelphia, Pa. 1926.
 Miss ELSIE BENKARD, 132 East 65th St., New York, N. Y. 1929.
 Prof. C. THEODORE BENZE, D.D. (Lutheran Theol. Seminary), 7304 Boyer St., Mt. Airy, Pa. 1916.
 Dr. C. C. BERG, Hooge Rijndijk 152, Leiden, Holland. 1926.
 MOSHE BERKOOZ, 4620 N. Mervine St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1929.
 Rabbi MORTON M. BERMAN, Jewish Institute of Religion, 40 West 68th St., New York, N. Y. 1929.
 OSCAR BERMAN, Third and Plum Sts., Cincinnati, Ohio. 1920.
 PIERRE A. BERNARD, Clarkstown Country Club, Nyack, N. Y. 1914.
 ISAAC W. BERNHEIM, 825 York St., Denver, Colo. 1920.
 Dr. SIMON BERNSTEIN, 111 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y. 1928.
 Prof. GEORGE R. BERRY, Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y. 1907.
 Prof. JULIUS A. BEWER (Union Theol. Seminary), 606 West 122nd St., New York, N. Y. 1929 (1907).

- Prof. D. R. BHANDARKAR (Univ. of Calcutta), 35 Ballygunge Circular Road, Calcutta, India. 1921.
- Prof. A. E. BIGELOW, care of Fannie Doane Home, Granville, Ohio. 1927 (1922).
- CARL W. BISHOP, American Legation, Peiping, China. 1917.
- Prof. F. LOVELL BIXBY, The Rice Institute, Houston, Texas. 1928.
- Rabbi EUGENE BLACHSCHLEGER, 3122 Kensington Ave., Richmond, Va. 1928.
- Pres. JAMES A. BLAISDELL, Claremont Colleges, Claremont, Calif. 1928.
- Prof. FRANK RINGGOLD BLAKE (Johns Hopkins Univ.), 1600 Park Ave., Baltimore, Md. 1900.
- Rabbi SHELDON H. BLANK, Ph.D., Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1926.
- Rev. Dr. JOSHUA BLOCH, New York Public Library, 476 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y. 1921.
- Prof. LEONARD BLOOMFIELD, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1927 (1917).
- Mrs. MAURICE BLOOMFIELD, c/o Townsend Scott and Son, 209 East Fayette St., Baltimore, Md. 1928.
- Prof. PAUL F. BLOOMHARDT, Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio. 1916.
- EMANUEL BOASBERG, 1296 Delaware Ave., Buffalo, N. Y. 1921.
- GEORGE BOBINSKOY, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1925.
- Rev. PAUL OLAF BODDING, Mohulpahari, Santal Parganas, India. 1928.
- Prof. FRANZ M. T. BÜHL, D.D., Ph.D. (Univ. of Leiden), Rapenburg 53, Leiden, Holland. 1928.
- Rev. AUGUST M. BOLDOC, S.T.L., The Marist College, Brookland, Washington, D. C. 1921.
- *Prof. GEORGE M. BOLLING (Ohio State Univ.), 777 Franklin Ave., Columbus, Ohio. 1896.
- Prof. CAMPBELL BONNER, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1920.
- Prof. CLARENCE BOUMA, Th.D. (Calvin College), 925 Alexander St., S. E., Grand Rapids, Mich. 1928.
- Rev. A. M. BOYER, 114 Rue du Bac, Paris VIIe, France. 1928.
- WATSON BOYES, 9850 84th Ave., Edmonton, Alta., Canada. 1928.
- Prof. CHARLES S. BRADEN, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. 1926.
- AARON BRAV, M.D., 2027 Spruce St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1924.
- Prof. JAMES HENRY BREASTED, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1891.
- Rabbi BARNETT R. BRICKNER, 8206 Euclid Ave., Cleveland, Ohio. 1926.
- Miss EMILIE GRACE BRIGGS, Hotel Holley, 36 Washington Square West, New York, N. Y. 1920.
- Prof. GEORGE WESTON BRIGGS, M.Sc. (Drew Theol. Seminary), Green Village Road, Madison, N. J. 1923.
- NOAH BRODY, 305 Upland St., Chester, Pa. 1929.
- Rev. CHARLES D. BROKENSHIRE, Lock Box 56, Alma, Mich. 1917.
- Mrs. BEATRICE ALLARD BROOKS, Ph.D. (Wellesley College), 9 State St., Wellesley, Mass. 1919.
- DAVID A. BROWN, 100 East 42nd St., New York, N. Y. 1921.

- Prof. GEORGE WILLIAM BROWN, Kennedy School of Missions, 55 Elizabeth St., Hartford, Conn. 1909.
- Dean OSWALD E. BROWN, Vanderbilt University School of Religion, Nashville, Tenn. 1926.
- Prof. W. NORMAN BROWN, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1916.
- Prof. CARL DARLING BUCK, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1892.
- Prof. FRANCIS W. BUCKLER (Oberlin Graduate School of Theology), 69 South Professor St., Oberlin, Ohio. 1926.
- Dr. LUDLOW S. BULL, Associate Curator, Egyptian Dept., Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, N. Y. 1917.
- ALEXANDER H. BULLOCK, State Mutual Building, Worcester, Mass. 1910.
- Prof. MILLAR BURBOWS (Brown Univ.), 262 Fifth St., Providence, R. I. 1925.
- Prof. ROMAIN BUTIN, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C. 1915.
- Prof. MOSES BUTTENWIESER (Hebrew Union College), 252 Loraine Ave., Cincinnati, Ohio. 1917.
- Prof. EUGENE H. BYRNE (Univ. of Wisconsin), 2006 Chadbourne Place, Madison, Wis. 1917.
- Prof. HENRY J. CADBURY (Bryn Mawr College), 3 College Circle, Haverford, Pa. 1914.
- Prof. LYMAN V. CADY, 408 West Pike St., Crawfordsville, Ind. 1929.
- Rev. JOHN CAMPBELL, Ph.D., 260 West 231st St., New York, N. Y. 1896.
- Prof. ALBERT J. CARNOY (Univ. of Louvain), Sparrenhof, Corbeek-Loo, Belgium. 1916.
- PAUL R. CARR, 3923 Packard St., Long Island City, N. Y. 1928.
- Dr. JOHN F. B. CARRUTHERS, 1015 Prospect Boulevard, Pasadena, Calif. 1923.
- HARRY W. CARTWRIGHT, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1928.
- RALPH M. CHAIT, 19 East 56th St., New York, N. Y. 1929.
- Prof. BASIL HALL CHAMBERLAIN, c/o Lloyds Bank, Law Courts Branch, 222 Strand, London, England. 1928.
- HENRY HARMON CHAMBERLIN, 22 May St., Worcester, Mass. 1921.
- Rev. JOHN S. CHANDLER, D. D., Woodstock, Kodaikanal, South India. 1899.
- Miss HELEN B. CHAPIN, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Mass. 1929.
- Dr. WILLIAM J. CHAPMAN, New Boston, Mass. 1922.
- Prof. JARL H. R. T. CHARPENTIER, Ph.D. (Univ. of Upsala), 12 Goethgatan, Upsala, Sweden. 1928.
- Mrs. HAROLD S. CHARTER, 37 North Boulevard, Gloversville, N. Y. 1924.
- Sir ATUL CHATTERJEE, K.C.I.E., High Commissioner for India, 42 Grosvenor Gardens, London, S.W. 1, England. 1929.
- JAGADISH CHANDRA CHATTERJI, Director, International School of Vedic and Allied Research, Room 1500, Times Bldg., New York, N. Y. 1927.
- KSHETRESHCHANDRA CHATTOPADHYAYA, M.A., Sanskrit Department, The University, Allahabad, U. P., India. 1925.

- Prof. EDWARD CHIERA, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1915.
 Dr. WILLIAM CHOMSKY, 6236 North Broad St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1928.
 Prof. WALTER E. CLARK (Harvard University), 39 Kirkland St., Cambridge, Mass. 1906.
 † Miss LUCY CLEVELAND, P. O. Box 117, Times Square Station, New York, N. Y. 1923.
 Rabbi ADOLPH COBLENTZ, 2029 Eutaw Place, Baltimore, Md. 1928.
 †* ALEXANDER SMITH COCHRAN, 475 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y. 1908.
 ALFRED M. COHEN, 9 West 4th St., Cincinnati, Ohio. 1920.
 Rabbi HENRY COHEN, D.D., 1920 Broadway, Galveston, Texas. 1920.
 Prof. SAMUEL S. COHON, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1917.
 *Prof. HERMANN COLLITZ (Johns Hopkins Univ.), 1027 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Md. 1887.
 Dr. MAUDE GAECKLER (Mrs. H. M.) COOK, Box 175, Belton, Texas. 1915.
 Rev. GEORGE S. COOKE, Wissahickon Inn, Redlands, Calif. 1917.
 Dr. ANANDA K. COOMARASWAMY, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Mass. 1917.
 *Prof. DOUGLAS HILARY CORLEY, 1224 Cherokee Road, Louisville, Ky. 1922.
 Rev. RALPH D. CORNUELLE, American Presbyterian Mission, Fatehgarh, U. P., India. 1922.
 Dr. WILLIAM COWEN, 35 East 60th St., New York, N. Y. 1922.
 Sir J. C. COYAJEE (Presidency College), c/o Park St. Branch, Imperial Bank of India, Calcutta, India. 1928.
 Rev. WILLIAM MERRIAM CRANE, Ph.D., Richmond, Mass. 1902.
 Prof. JOHN WALLIS CREIGHTON (College of Wooster), 1681 Burbank Road, Wooster, Ohio. 1929.
 Rev. JOHN R. CROSBY, Ph.D., D.D., St. Elizabeth's Rectory, 1606 Mifflin St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1927.
 Prof. EARLE B. CROSS, Rochester Theological Seminary, Rochester, N. Y. 1927.
 Prof. DAVID E. CULLEY, D.D. (Western Theol. Seminary), 57 Belvidere St., Crafton, Pa. 1928.
 Miss HARRYET M. D. CULLEY, 1717 North 23rd St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1929.
 Prof. CHARLES GORDON CUMMING (Bangor Theol. Seminary), 353 Hammond St., Bangor, Maine. 1928.
 Miss CECILIA CUTTS (Univ. of Washington), 6011 31st Ave., N.E., Seattle, Wash. 1926.
 Prof. M. ELIZ. J. CZARNOMSKA, Sweet Briar College, Sweet Briar, Va. 1928.
 Prof. GEORGE H. DANTON (Oberlin College), 263 Elm St., Oberlin, Ohio. 1921.
 Prof. ISRAEL DAVIDSON (Jewish Theol. Seminary), 92 Morningside Ave., New York, N. Y. 1921.
 JOHN K. DAVIS, American Consulate General, London, England. 1927.
 Prof. FRANK LEIGHTON DAY, Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Va. 1920.
 Prof. JOHN PITT DEANE, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis. 1926.
 NELSON C. DEBEVOISE, 5728 Blackstone Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1927.

- Dean IRWIN HOCH DELONG (Theol. Seminary of the Reformed Church),
523 West James St., Lancaster, Pa. 1916.
- ARTHUR A. DEMBITZ, 1631 North 32d St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1926.
- Prof. ROBERT E. DENGLEB (Pennsylvania State College), 210 South Gill
St., State College, Pa. 1920.
- JOHN HOPKINS DENISON, The University Club, 1 West 54th St., New York,
N. Y. 1929.
- RAMA DEVA, Principal, The Gurukula, Kangri P. O., Bijnor Dist., U. P.,
India. 1928.
- JAMES DEVADASAN, Theological Seminary, Bareilly, India. 1929.
- HERBERT J. DEVINE, The Shelton, Lexington Ave. and 49th St., New York,
N. Y. 1929.
- Mrs. A. SANDERS DEWITT, 4854 Third Ave., Detroit, Mich. 1928.
- NARIMAN M. DHALLA, M.A., 15 Royal Artillery Lines, Karachi, India.
1922.
- Mrs. FRANCIS W. DICKINS, 2015 Columbia Road, Washington, D. C. 1911.
- Dr. FREDERICK W. DICKINSON, College of Mount St. Joseph, Mount St.
Joseph, Ohio. 1929.
- Prof. ERNST DIEZ, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 1928.
- Pres. BAYARD DODGE, American University of Beirut, Beirut, Syria. 1926.
- Rev. MARTIN LUTHER DOLBEER, Battle Creek Sanitarium, Battle Creek,
Mich. 1929.
- LEON DOMINIAN, American Consulate General, Rome, Italy. 1916.
- Rev. DWIGHT M. DONALDSON, Ph.D., D.D., Meshed, Persia. 1928.
- Prof. AGNES C. L. DONOHUGH (Hartford Seminary Foundation), 23 Mid-
land Ave., White Plains, N. Y. 1926.
- Rev. A. T. DORF, 945 East 53rd St., Chicago, Ill. 1916.
- Dr. GEORGES DOSSIN (Univ. of Liège), 20 Rue des Ecoles, Wandre-lez-
Liège, Belgium. 1926.
- Prof. RAYMOND P. DOUGHERTY (Yale Univ.), 319 Willow St., New Haven,
Conn. 1918.
- Dr. CHARLES HAROLD DOUGLAS (Seminary and Collegiate Bible Inst.), 1316
Vermont Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. 1928.
- Prof. JOHN DOW, 50 St. George St., Toronto, Canada. 1929.
- Prof. FREDERIC C. DUNCALF, University of Texas, Austin, Texas. 1919.
- Prof. GEORGE S. DUNCAN (American Univ., Y. M. C. A. School of Religion),
2900 Seventh St., N. E., Washington, D. C. 1917.
- DOWS DUNHAM, Assistant Curator, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Mass.
1929.
- Prof. CHARLES DUROISSELLE, M.A. (Rangoon Univ.), "C" Road, Mandalay,
Burma. 1922.
- ALVAN C. EASTMAN, c/o W. P. Abbott, Suffern, N. Y. 1929.
- Prof. FRANKLIN EDGERTON, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. 1910.
- Dr. WILLIAM F. EDGERTON, care of Brown, Shipley & Co., 123 Pall Mall,
London, England. 1917.
- Dean GRANVILLE D. EDWARDS (Missouri Bible College), 811 College Ave.,
Columbia, Mo. 1917.

- Rev. Dr. ISRAEL EFROS, Temple Beth El, 153 Richmond Ave., Buffalo, N. Y. 1918.
- Rabbi LOUIS I. EGELSON, 2 Avon Apts., Reading Road and Clifton Springs Ave., Cincinnati, Ohio. 1927.
- Pres. FREDERICK C. EISELEN, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill. 1901.
- Dr. ISRAEL EITAN, 270 North Craig St., Pittsburgh, Pa. 1928.
- ABRAM I. ELKUS, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1921.
- Rev. Dr. BARNETT A. ELZAS, 42 West 72d St., New York, N. Y. 1923.
- MURRAY B. EMENEAU (Yale Univ.), 1910 Yale Station, New Haven, Conn. 1929.
- Rabbi H. G. ENELOW, D.D., Temple Emanu-El, 1 East 65th St., New York, N. Y. 1921.
- Prof. MORTON SCOTT ENSLIN (Crozer Theol. Seminary), 4 Seminary Ave., Chester, Pa. 1925.
- SIDNEY I. ESTERSON, 113 North Chester St., Baltimore, Md. 1926.
- Pres. MILTON G. EVANS, Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa. 1921.
- Dr. SAMUEL FEIGIN, 135 South Aiken Ave., E. E., Pittsburgh, Pa. 1924.
- Dr. SHAMMAI FELDMAN, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. 1926.
- FRANCIS JOSEPH FENDLEY, 2234 Q St., N. W., Washington, D. C. 1927.
- HENRY COURTENAY FENN, 534 West 124th St., New York, N. Y. 1929.
- Dr. JOHN C. FERGUSON, Peking, China. 1900.
- Miss HELEN E. FERNALD, Assistant Curator, University of Pennsylvania Museum, Philadelphia, Pa. 1927.
- Prof. BENIGNO FERRARIO, Casilla de Correo 445, Montevideo, Uruguay. 1927.
- Rabbi MORRIS M. FEUERLICHT, 3034 Washington Boulevard, Indianapolis, Ind. 1922.
- HENRY FIELD, Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago, Ill. 1929.
- Rabbi WILLIAM H. FINESHRIER, 1916 Rittenhouse Square, Philadelphia, Pa. 1926.
- Dr. SOLOMON B. FINESINGER, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1922.
- Rabbi JOSEPH L. FINK, 599 Delaware Ave., Buffalo, N. Y. 1920.
- Dr. JOSHUA FINKEL, 3505 Ave. I, Brooklyn, N. Y. 1929.
- Dr. LOUIS FINKELSTEIN, Jewish Theological Seminary, 531 West 123d St., New York, N. Y. 1921.
- Prof. DANIEL J. FLEMING, D.D., Union Theological Seminary, 3041 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1928.
- Rev. FRED FOERSTER, Ph.D., First Lutheran Church, Jeffersonville, N. Y. 1926.
- * MAYNARD DAUCHY FOLLIN, P. O. Box 118, Detroit, Mich. 1922.
- Mrs. FLORENCE CAMPBELL FORRESTER, 1700 Rhode Island Ave., Washington, D. C. 1927.
- Dean HUGHELL E. W. FOSBROKE, General Theological Seminary, Chelsea Square, New York, N. Y. 1917 (1907).
- Rabbi SOLOMON FOSTER, 90 Treacy Ave., Newark, N. J. 1921.

- Rev. WILLIAM M. FOUTS, Th.D., 3040 W. Washington Boulevard, Station D, Chicago, Ill. 1929.
- Prof. HENRY T. FOWLER, Brown University, Providence, R. I. 1926.
- Rabbi GRESHAM GEORGE FOX, Ph.D., 7524 Esses Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1924.
- Rabbi LEON FRAM, 8801 Woodward Ave., Detroit, Mich. 1926.
- Prof. JAMES EVERETT FRAME, Union Theological Seminary, Broadway and 120th St., New York, N. Y. 1892.
- W. B. FRANKENSTEIN, 9 West Kinzie St., Chicago, Ill. 1921.
- Rabbi LEO M. FRANKLIN, M.A., 26 Edison Ave., Detroit, Mich. 1920.
- Rabbi SOLOMON B. FREEHOF, D.D., Hotel Aragon, 54th St. and Cornell Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1918.
- MAURICE J. FREIBERG, 701 First National Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1920.
- Prof. ALEXANDER FREIMAN, Ph.D. (Univ. of Leningrad), Zwerinskaya 40, Leningrad, U. S. S. R. 1928.
- Rabbi HIRSCH L. FREUND, 226 N. Washington St., Sumter, S. C. 1929.
- Prof. LESLIE ELMER FULLER, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill. 1916.
- Prof. KEMPER FULLERTON, Oberlin Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin, Ohio. 1916.
- ERWIN H. FURMAN, 1750 Sycamore Ave., Hollywood, Calif. 1928.
- *Prof. A. B. GAJENDRAGADKAR, Elphinstone College, Bombay, India. 1921.
- Prof. ESSON M. GALE, University of California, Berkeley, Calif. 1929.
- ALEXANDER B. GALT, 2219 California St., Washington, D. C. 1917.
- KANHAIYA LAL GARGIYA, The Mahalakshmi Mills Co., Ltd., Beawar, Rajputana, India. 1927.
- Pres. CALEB F. GATES, LL.D., Robert College, Constantinople, Turkey. 1929.
- Prof. FRANK GAVIN, General Theological Seminary, Chelsea Square, New York, N. Y. 1917.
- Dr. F. W. GEERS (Oriental Inst., Univ. of Chicago), 810 Hyde Park Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. 1928.
- Dr. HENRY SNYDER GEHMAN, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1916.
- EUGENE A. GELLOT, 290 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1911.
- Prof. BEREND GEMSER, Litt. Dr., Theol. Dr., Transvaal University College, Pretoria, South Africa. 1928.
- Rev. PHARES B. GIBBLE, 4 North College St., Palmyra, Pa. 1921.
- Miss MARY S. M. GIBSON, Curator, Cooper Union Museum of Art, Fourth Ave. and Eighth St., New York, N. Y. 1928.
- Rev. Dr. GEORGE W. GILMORE, The Homiletic Review, 354 Fourth Ave., New York, N. Y. 1928.
- Rabbi NELSON GLUECK, Ph.D., Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1928.
- Prof. ALLEN H. GODBEX, Duke University, Durham, N. C. 1928.
- Rev. CRANSTON E. GODDARD, c/o First Presbyterian Church, Independence, Mo. 1927.
- Rabbi S. H. GOLDENSON, Ph.D., 4905 Fifth Ave., Pittsburgh, Pa. 1920.

- Rabbi SOLOMON GOLDMAN, c/o Anshe Emes Congregation, 3762 Pine Grove Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1920.
- Dr. JANE F. GOODLOE, Goucher College, Baltimore, Md. 1926.
- L. CARRINGTON GOODRICH (Columbia Univ.), 640 West 238th St., New York, N. Y. 1929.
- Prof. ALEXANDER R. GORDON, United Theological College, Montreal, Que., Canada. 1912.
- CYRUS H. GORDON, 6026 Carpenter St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1928.
- HIRSCH LOEB GORDON, Ph.D., D.H.L., 146 Manhattan Ave., Jersey City, N. J. 1929.
- *Prof. RICHARD J. H. GOTTHEIL, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1886.
- KINGDON GOULD, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1914.
- Prof. HERBERT HENRY GOWEN, D.D. (Univ. of Washington), 5005 22d Ave., N. E., Seattle, Wash. 1920.
- Prof. WILLIAM CREIGHTON GRAHAM, Box 2, Faculty Exchange, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1921.
- Prof. ELIHU GRANT, Haverford College, Haverford, Pa. 1907.
- Dean FREDERICK C. GRANT (Western Theol. Seminary), 600 Haven St., Evanston, Ill. 1929.
- JACOB GRAPE, 1575 Abbottston St., Baltimore, Md. 1926.
- BENJ. F. GRAVELY, P. O. Box 209, Martinsville, Va. 1925.
- MORTIMER GRAVES, Assistant Secretary, American Council of Learned Societies, 907 Fifteenth St., Washington, D. C. 1929.
- SOLOMON GRAYZEL, 200 South 39th St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1929.
- Rabbi SIMON GREENBERG, 5635 Wyndale Ave., Philadelphia, Pa. 1928.
- ROGER S. GREENE, China Medical Board, The Rockefeller Foundation, 61 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1926.
- M. E. GREENEBAUM, 9 South La Salle St., Chicago, Ill. 1920.
- *Miss LUCIA C. G. GRIEVE, 211 Wardwell Ave., Westerleigh, Staten Island, N. Y. 1894.
- Prof. ELDON GRIFFIN (Univ. of Washington), 4726-47th Ave., N. E., Seattle, Wash. 1929.
- Rev. Dr. HERVEY D. GRISWOLD, 20 Rowsley St., Bridgeport, Conn. 1920.
- MICHAEL J. GRUENTHNER, Weston College, Weston, Mass. 1929.
- Prof. LÉON GRÉY (Université libre d'Angers), 10 Rue La Fontaine, Angers, M.-et-L., France. 1921.
- W. F. GUNAWARDHANA, Rose Villa, Mount Lavinia, Ceylon. 1928.
- Babu SHIVA PRASAD GUPTA, Seva Upavana, Hindu University, Benares, India. 1921.
- † Pres. WILLIAM W. GUTH, Ph.D., Goucher College, Baltimore, Md. 1920.
- Dr. CARL E. GUTHE (Univ. of Michigan), 1047 Martin Place, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1928.
- *Prof. GEORGE C. O. HAAS (Internat. School of Vedic and Allied Research), 29 Claremont Ave., New York, N. Y. 1903.
- Prof. WILLIAM J. HAIL, D.D., College of Wooster, Wooster, Ohio. 1928.

- Dr. GEORGE ELLERY HALE, Director, Mt. Wilson Observatory, Pasadena, Calif. 1920.
- ABRAHAM S. HALKIN (Columbia Univ.), 1426 Clinton Ave., New York, N. Y. 1927.
- Prof. FRANK H. HALLOCK, D.D., Buffalo, Wyo. 1926.
- Prof. CLARENCE H. HAMILTON (Hartford Seminary Foundation), 55 Elizabeth St., Hartford, Conn. 1926.
- VALDEMAR T. HAMMER, Branford, Conn. 1925.
- Prof. MAX S. HANDMAN, University of Texas, Austin, Texas. 1919.
- Dr. E. S. CRAIGHILL HANDY, Bernice P. Bishop Museum, Honolulu, Hawaii. 1924.
- * Rev. EDWARD ROCHIE HARDY, JR., A.M., 419 West 118th St., New York, N. Y. 1924.
- Pres. FRANKLIN STEWART HARRIS, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah. 1929.
- SELIG HARRIS, 5601 Diamond St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1929.
- Rev. MAX H. HARRISON, Jaffna College, Vaddukoddai, Ceylon. 1927.
- HENRY H. HART, J.D., 328 Post St., San Francisco, Calif. 1925.
- ARCHIBALD CLINTON HARTE, LL.D., P. O. Box 294, Jerusalem, Palestine. 1929.
- JOEL HATHEWAY, 15 Beacon St., Boston, Mass. 1923.
- Prof. RAYMOND S. HAUPERT, Moravian College and Theological Seminary, Bethlehem, Pa. 1926.
- Prof. A. EUSTACE HAYDON, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1922.
- WYNDEHAM HAYWARD, 1200 E. Robinson Ave., Orlando, Fla. 1925.
- Rev. Dr. JOHN HEDLEY, Methodist Episcopal Mission, P. O. Box 2956, Honolulu, Hawaii. 1926.
- LOUIS F. HEINRICHSMEYER, 4 Concordia Place, Bronxville, N. Y. 1928.
- Rabbi JAMES G. HELLEB, 3634 Reading Road, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1920.
- Rev. JAMES M. HESS, American College, Madura, S. India. 1928.
- EDWIN B. HEWES, 507-509 West 112th St., New York, N. Y. 1922.
- EUGENE E. HIBSHMAN, 3004 Union Ave., Altoona, Pa. 1929.
- Prof. RALPH K. HICKOK, Wells College, Aurora, N. Y. 1924.
- ROWLAND H. C. HILL, 1A Union St., Bangalore, S. India. 1929.
- Prof. WILLIAM BANCROFT HILL, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1921.
- Prof. WILLIAM J. HINKE (Auburn Theol. Seminary), 156 North St., Auburn, N. Y. 1907.
- RAI BAHADUR HIRALAL, Katni Murwara, C. P., India. 1928.
- Prof. HARTWIG HIRSCHFELD, Ph.D. (Univ. of London), 14 Randolph Gardens, London N. W. 6, England. 1928.
- Prof. PHILIP K. HITTI, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1915.
- Dean CHARLES T. HOCK, D.D. (Bloomfield Theol. Seminary), 222 Liberty St., Bloomfield, N. J. 1921 (1903).
- Prof. LEWIS HODOUS (Hartford Seminary Foundation), 92 Sherman St., Hartford, Conn. 1919.
- G. F. HOFF, 403 Union Building, San Diego, Calif. 1920.
- Rev. WILLIS E. HOGG, 122 E. North St., Geneseo, Ill. 1926.

- *Prof. E. WASHBURN HOPKINS (Yale Univ.), 299 Lawrence St., New Haven, Conn. 1881.
- LOUIS L. HORCH, 905 West End Ave., New York, N. Y. 1928.
- WILLIAM WOODWARD HORNELL, Vice-Chancellor, Hong-Kong University, Hong-Kong, China. 1928.
- Prof. JACOB HOSCHANDER (Jewish Theol. Seminary), 218 West 112th St., New York, N. Y. 1914.
- Prof. HERBERT PIERREPONT HOUGHTON, Carleton College, Northfield, Minn. 1925.
- Rev. QUENTIN K. Y. HUANG, American Church Mission, Nanchang, Kiangsi, China. 1927.
- Dr. EDWARD H. HUME, Director, New York Post-Graduate Medical School and Hospital, 303 East 20th St., New York, N. Y. 1909.
- Prof. ROBERT ERNEST HUME (Union Theol. Seminary), 606 West 122nd St., New York, N. Y. 1914.
- ARTHUR W. HUMMEL, Chinese Collection, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C. 1928.
- Dean ROCKWELL D. HUNT (Univ. of Southern California), 5143 Brynhurst Ave., Los Angeles, Calif. 1928.
- *Dr. ARCHER M. HUNTINGTON, 3 East 89th St., New York, N. Y. 1912.
- Prof. ISAAC HUSIK, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1916.
- Prof. MARY INDA HUSSEY, Mt. Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass. 1901.
- Rev. Dr. MOSES HYAMSON (Jewish Theol. Seminary), 65 East 96th St., New York, N. Y. 1921.
- *JAMES HAZEN HYDE, 67 Boulevard Lannes, Paris, France. 1909.
- Prof. WALTER WOODBURN HYDE, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1920.
- *Prof. HENRY HYVERNAT (Catholic Univ. of America), 3405 Twelfth St., N. E. (Brookland), Washington, D. C. 1889.
- Prof. ABRAHAM Z. IDELSOHN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1926.
- J. H. INGRAM, M. D., American Board Mission, Peking, China. 1924.
- Prof. MOHAMMAD IQBAL, Ph. D., Oriental College, Punjab University, Lahore, India. 1926.
- Prof. W. A. IRWIN, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ont., Canada. 1927.
- Prof. K. A. SUBRAMANIA IYER, M. A., University of Lucknow, Lucknow, India. 1926.
- SULEIMAN A. IZZEDDIN, P. O. Box 626, Beirut, Syria. 1927.
- *Prof. A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1885.
- Mrs. A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON, care of Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1912.
- Prof. FREDERICK J. FOAKES JACKSON, D.D. (Union Theol. Seminary), Dana Place, Englewood, N. J. 1920.
- J. E. JADERQUIST, 536 S. Hope St., Los Angeles, Calif. 1928.
- Prof. ELIJAH J. JAMES, Hanover College, Hanover, Ind. 1929.

- Prof. R. D. JAMESON, National Tsing Hua University, Peiping, China. 1929.
- Mrs. MORRIS JASTROW, JR., 248 South 23d St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1922.
- DON BARON JAYATILAKA, M.A., Westerfield, Castle St., Colombo, Ceylon. 1928.
- Rev. Prof. ARTHUR JEFFREY, American University, 113 Sharia Kasr el Aini, Cairo, Egypt. 1923.
- Dr. GEORGE JESHURUN, 5511 15th Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y. 1925.
- *Prof. JAMES RICHARD JEWETT, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1887.
- MUNI JINAVIJAYAJI, Principal, Gujarat Puratattva Mandir, Ellisbridge, Ahmedabad, India. 1928.
- Rev. FREDERICK WILLIAM JOHNSON, Westerhope Vicarage, Newcastle-on-Tyne, England. 1926.
- *Dr. HELEN M. JOHNSON, Osceola, Mo. 1921.
- HON. NELSON TRUSLER JOHNSON, American Legation, Peiping, China. 1921.
- Prof. OBED SIMON JOHNSON, Wabash College, Crawfordville, Ind. 1929.
- Capt. SAMUEL JOHNSON, P. O. Box 611, Jerusalem, Palestine. 1928.
- CHARLES JOHNSTON, 26 Washington Square, New York, N. Y. 1921.
- REGINALD F. JOHNSTON, Government House, Weihaiwei, China. 1919.
- Rev. FRANKLIN JOINER, 2013 Appletree St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1925.
- Rev. CONRAD W. JORDAN, 101 Sefton Ave., Hamilton, Md. 1925.
- Prof. S. L. JOSHI, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. 1927.
- SUNDER JOSHI, 149 Hancock St., Cambridge, Mass. 1929.
- Prof. MOSES JUNG, 625 East Green St., Champaign, Ill. 1926.
- Dean MAXIMO M. KALAW, University of the Philippines, Manila, P. I. 1922.
- Dr. LOUIS L. KAPLAN, 489 Willoughby Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y. 1926.
- Prof. GENCHI KATO (Imperial Univ. of Tokyo), 11 Maruyamacho, Koishikawa, Tokyo, Japan. 1928.
- Prof. VISHWANATH KAUL, c/o The Jayaji Pratap, Gwalior, Central India. 1928.
- Prof. ELMER LOUIS KAYSER (George Washington Univ.), 2100 G St., N. W., Washington, D. C. 1921.
- Rev. Dr. CLARENCE E. KEISER, Lyon Station, Pa. 1913.
- CHARLES PENROSE KEITH, Litt.D., 5219 Germantown Ave., Philadelphia, Pa. 1929.
- CARL T. KELLER, 80 Federal St., Boston, Mass. 1928.
- CHARLES FABENS KELLEY, The Art Institute of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1926.
- *Prof. MAX L. KELLNER, D.D., 3 Concord Ave., Cambridge, Mass. 1886.
- JOHN P. KELLOGG, Illinois Merchants Trust Co., Chicago, Ill. 1926.
- Prof. ROBERT J. KELLOGG, Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kans. 1926.
- Prof. FREDERICK T. KELLY (Univ. of Wisconsin), 2019 Monroe St., Madison, Wis. 1917.
- Pres. JAMES A. KELSO, Western Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, Pa. 1915.

- Prof. JAMES L. KELSO, Xenia Theological Seminary, St. Louis, Mo. 1921.
 Rev. JOHN M. KELSO, Williamsport, Pa. 1923.
 Prof. ELIZA H. KENDRICK, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. 1896.
 Prof. ROLAND G. KENT, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1910.
 Prof. ANDREW KEOGH (Yale Univ.), 49 Huntington St., New Haven, Conn. 1925.
 Prof. H. A. F. KERN, M.D., D.D. (Susquehanna Univ.), 311 N. Market St., Selins Grove, Pa. 1929.
 LEEDS C. KERR, Army and Navy Club, Washington, D. C. 1916.
 Rev. ROBERT O. KEVIN, JR., Philadelphia Divinity School, 42d and Locust Sts., Philadelphia, Pa. 1926.
 H. KEVORKIAN, 40 West 57th St., New York, N. Y. 1927.
 GANDA SINGH KEWAL, Ph.B., B.Sc., P. O. Box No. 1, Abadan, Persian Gulf. 1929.
 Prof. ANIS E. KHURI, American University of Beirut, Beirut, Syria. 1921.
 Dr. GEORGE B. KING, Wesley College, Winnipeg, Man., Canada. 1927.
 KARL KIRCHBERGER, c/o National Liberal Club, 1 Whitehall, London, S.W., England. 1928.
 Prof. GEORGE L. KITTREDGE (Harvard Univ.), 8 Hilliard St., Cambridge, Mass. 1899.
 EUGENE KLEIN, 44 North 50th St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1920.
 Prof. CARL S. KNOPF, Yale Station, New Haven, Conn. 1929.
 Rev. Dr. RAYMOND C. KNOX, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1928.
 TAW SEIN KO, C.I.E., Peking Lodge, West Moat Road, Mandalay, Burma. 1922.
 Dr. GEORGE ALEXANDER KOHUT, 1 West 70th St., New York, N. Y. 1924 (1894).
 Prof. CARL H. KRAELING (Yale Univ.), 67 Ridgewood Ave., New Haven, Conn. 1925.
 Rev. EMIL G. H. KRAELING, Ph.D. (Union Theol. Seminary), 531 East 18th St., Brooklyn, N. Y. 1920.
 S. N. KRAMER, 930 Flanders Road, Philadelphia, Pa. 1928.
 Rabbi NATHAN KRASS, D.D., Temple Emanu-El, 1 East 65th St., New York, N. Y. 1924.
 Pres. MELVIN G. KYLE, Xenia Theological Seminary, St. Louis, Mo. 1909.
 Mrs. OLIVER LA FARGE, 2d (née Mathews), 450 East 57th St., New York, N. Y. 1929.
 Miss M. ANTONIA LAMB, 212 South 46th St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.
 Rev. Dr. MILTON B. LAMBDIN, 3534 Park Place, N. W., Washington, D. C. 1928.
 SAMUEL C. LAMPORT, 509 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1928.
 Rabbi ISAAC LANDMAN, 333 Central Park West, New York, N. Y. 1927.
 *Prof. CHARLES ROCKWELL LANMAN (Harvard Univ.), 9 Farrar St., Cambridge, Mass. 1876.
 AMBROSE LANSING, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, N. Y. 1921.
 GEORGE J. LAPP, 3435 W. Van Buren St., Chicago, Ill. 1929.

- Prof. KENNETH S. LATOURETTE, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. 1917.
Dr. BERTHOLD LAUFER, Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago, Ill. 1900.
Prof. JACOB Z. LAUTERBACH, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1918.
Dr. BIMALA C. LAW, 43 Kailas Bose St., Calcutta, India. 1926.
SIMON LAZARUS, High and Town Sts., Columbus, Ohio. 1921.
JOHN W. LEA, 1520 North Robinson St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1924.
Prof. DARWIN A. LEAVITT, 641 Church St., Beloit, Wis. 1920.
Prof. SHAO CHANG LEE, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii. 1928.
Rabbi DAVID LEFKOWITZ, 2415 South Boulevard, Dallas, Texas. 1921.
Rev. Dr. LÉON LEGRAIN, University of Pennsylvania Museum, Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.
Prof. KURT F. LEIDECKER, International School of Vedic and Allied Research, Times Building, 1475 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1928.
FLORIN (JONES) LENOX, 150 East 50th St., New York, N. Y. 1918.
ALBERT J. LEON, Hotel Ansonia, 73d St. and Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1928.
Prof. HARRY J. LEON (Univ. of Texas), 2832 Pearl St., Austin, Texas. 1928.
Rabbi GERSON B. LEVI, Ph.D., 919 Hyde Park Boulevard, Hyde Park Station, Chicago, Ill. 1917.
Dr. JOSEPH LEVITSKY (Gratz College), 1737 North 32nd St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1928.
Dr. ABRAHAM J. LEVY (College of Jewish Studies), 3123 Douglas Blvd., Chicago, Ill. 1924.
Rev. Dr. FELIX A. LEVY, 445 Melrose St., Chicago, Ill. 1917.
*JOHN F. LEWIS, LL.D., 1914 Spruce St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1926.
Miss ETHEL J. LINDGREN, c/o Thos. Cook and Son, Peiping, China. 1928.
Dr. H. S. LINFIELD, American Jewish Committee, Room 1407, 171 Madison Ave., New York, N. Y. 1912.
Prof. ENNO LITTMANN, Ph.D., D.D. (Univ. of Tübingen), 50 Waldhauserstr., Tübingen, Germany. 1927 (1912).
JOHN ELLEERTON LODGE, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Mass. 1922.
Prof. CLAUDE M. LOTSPEICH, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1927.
Prof. HENRY WINTERS LUCE, D.D., c/o Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn. 1929.
Prof. HENRY F. LUTZ (University of California), 1147 Spruce St., Berkeley, Calif. 1916.
Prof. ALBERT HOWE LYBYER (Univ. of Illinois), 1006 West Nevada St., Urbana, Ill. 1917 (1909).
*Prof. DAVID GORDON LYON, 12 Scott St., Cambridge, Mass. 1882.
ALBERT MORTON LYTTHGOE, Curator, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, N. Y. 1899.
Rev. WILLIAM H. MCCLELLAN, S.J., Woodstock College, Woodstock, Md. 1922.

- Prof. CHESTER CHARLTON McCOWN, D.D., Director, American School of Oriental Research, Jerusalem, Palestine. 1920.
- Prof. DUNCAN B. MACDONALD, Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn. 1893.
- Rev. W. C. MACDOUGALL, Ph.D., 405 Victoria St., London, Ont., Canada. 1927.
- Rev. Dr. WILLIAM MCGARRY, S.J., Weston College, Weston, Mass. 1928.
- Dr. WILLIAM MONTGOMERY MCGOVERN, 105 Harris Hall, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. 1928.
- DAVID ISRAEL MACHT, M.D., The Johns Hopkins University Medical School, Monument and Washington Sts., Baltimore, Md. 1918.
- J. ARTHUR MACLEAN, 582 Lincoln Ave., Toledo, Ohio. 1922.
- †Dr. ROBERT CECIL MACMAHON, 78 West 55th St., New York, N. Y. 1921.
- Prof. O. W. McMILLEN, Canton Union Language School, Fati, Canton, China. 1928.
- Prof. HARLEY F. MACNAIR, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1929.
- Rev. ALLAN ALEXANDER MACRAE, c/o American Express Co., Berlin, Germany. 1929.
- SWAMI MADHAVANANDA, Belur Math, Howrah District, Bengal, India. 1928.
- *Prof. HERBERT W. MAGOUN, 89 Hillcrest Road, Belmont, Mass. 1887.
- Prof. WALTER ARTHUR MATER (Lutheran Theol. Seminary), 801 DeMun Ave., St. Louis, Mo. 1917.
- Prof. CARROLL B. MALONE (Oberlin College), 195 S. Professor St., Oberlin, Ohio. 1929.
- Prof. JACOB MANN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1921.
- Rabbi LOUIS L. MANN, Ph.D., 4622 Grand Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. 1917.
- Prof. CLARENCE A. MANNING (Columbia Univ.), 25 East View Ave., Pleasantville, N. Y. 1921.
- *Rev. JAMES CAMPBELL MANRY, Institute of Character Research, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa. 1921.
- BENJAMIN MARCH, Curator, The Detroit Institute of Arts, Detroit, Mich. 1926.
- Prof. RALPH MARCUS (Jewish Inst. of Religion), 160 Claremont Ave., New York, N. Y. 1920.
- Rabbi ELIAS MARGOLIS, Ph.D., 16 Glen Ave., Mount Vernon, N. Y. 1924.
- Prof. MAX L. MARGOLIS, Dropsie College, Broad and York Sts., Philadelphia, Pa. 1890.
- JAMES P. MARSH, M.D., 12 Whitman Court, Troy, N. Y. 1919.
- JOHN MARTIN, North Adams, Mass. 1917.
- Dr. NICHOLAS B. MARTINOVITCH, 450 West 152nd St., New York, N. Y. 1924.
- Prof. ALEXANDER MARX, Jewish Theological Seminary, 531 West 123d St., New York, N. Y. 1926.
- Prof. MANMOHAN LAL MATHUR, Hindu Sabha College, Amritsar, New Delhi, India. 1927.

- Prof. ISAAC G. MATTHEWS, Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa. 1921 (1906).
- Prof. JOSEPH BROWN MATTHEWS, 2813 13th St., N.W., Washington, D. C. 1924.
- Rabbi HARRY H. MAYER, 3512 Kenwood Ave., Kansas City, Mo. 1921.
- Rev. THEODORE MAYER, 174 Schenck St., North Tonawanda, N. Y. 1929.
- Rev. Dr. JOHN A. MAYNARD, 7149 Juno St., Forest Hills, Long Island, N. Y. 1917.
- Prof. B. C. MAZUMDAR (University of Calcutta), 33/3 Lansdowne Road, Calcutta, India. 1926.
- Prof. THEOPHILE J. MEEK, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ont., Canada. 1917.
- Dean SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, Trinity College, Toronto, Ont., Canada. 1912.
- Mrs. EUGENE MEYER, 1727 Massachusetts Ave., Washington, D. C. 1916.
- Prof. TRUMAN MICHELSON (George Washington Univ.), Bureau of American Ethnology, Washington, D. C. 1899.
- MERTON L. MILLER, 4517 Lomita St., Los Angeles, Calif. 1921.
- Rev. PHILO LAOS MILLS, D.D., 2315 Lincoln Road, N. E., Washington, D. C. 1923.
- Prof. WALLACE H. MINER, 2206 Brun St., Hyde Park, Houston, Texas. 1925.
- A. MINGANA, 34 Mauldeth Rd., Withington, Manchester, England. 1928.
- Rabbi LOUIS A. MISCHKIND, M.A., 911 Washington St., Wilmington, Del. 1920.
- E. N. MOHL, P. O. Box 76, Jerusalem, Palestine. 1928.
- Dr. ROBERT LUDWIG MOND, 9 Cavendish Square, London W. 1, England. 1921.
- Prof. J. A. MONTGOMERY (Univ. of Pennsylvania), 6806 Greene St., Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa. 1903.
- LEWIS C. MOON, 3107 North Charles St., Baltimore, Md. 1925.
- Miss ELLEN W. MOORE, 19 East Pierce St., Coldwater, Mich. 1927.
- FRANK G. MOORE, 264 Tuxedo Ave., Elmhurst, Ill. 1927.
- Prof. GEORGE FOOT MOORE (Harvard Univ.), 3 Divinity Ave., Cambridge, Mass. 1925 (1887).
- Rev. HUGH A. MORAN, 221 Eddy St., Ithaca, N. Y. 1920.
- Pres. JULIAN MOEGENSTERN (Hebrew Union College), 8 Burton Woods Lane, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1915.
- *EFFINGHAM B. MORRIS, LL.D., "Tyn-y-Coed," Ardmore, Pa. 1920.
- Rev. RALPH MORTENSEN, Ph.D., Battle Lake, Minn. 1928.
- DAVID N. MOESSOHN, 255 West 84th St., New York, N. Y. 1929.
- Rev. OMER HILLMAN MOTT, 851 N. Broad St., Elizabeth, N. J. 1921.
- KHAN BAHADUR MIRZA MUHAMMAD, C.I.E., Shaikh's Market, Ashar, Basrah, Iraq. 1928.
- Prof. JAMES MUILENBURG (Mount Holyoke College), South Hadley, Mass. 1928.
- DHAN GOPAL MUKERJI, 325 East 72nd St., New York, N. Y. 1922.

- Prof. TOYOZO W. NAKARAI, College of Religion, Butler University, Indianapolis, Ind. 1926.
- Prof. ARJUNA NATHA, M. A., Hindu Sabha College, Amritsar, India. 1926.
- EDWARD I. NATHAN, American Consulate, Santiago de Cuba, Cuba. 1928.
- Prof. HAROLD H. NELSON (Univ. of Chicago), Chicago House, Luxor, Egypt. 1928.
- ALEX. A. NENNSBERG, 1909 Minor Ave., Seattle, Wash. 1925.
- Rev. Dr. WILLIAM M. NESBIT, Watertown, Conn. 1916.
- Rev. RALPH B. NESBITT, The Manse, Dehra Dun, U. P., India. 1924.
- Prof. ABRAHAM A. NEUMAN (Dropsie College), 2319 North Park Ave., Philadelphia, Pa. 1928.
- EDWARD THEODORE NEWELL, American Numismatic Society, 156th St. and Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1914.
- Prof. HERBERT LEE NEWMAN (Colby College), 2 West Court, Waterville, Maine. 1928.
- Rabbi LOUIS I. NEWMAN, 125 Jordan Ave., San Francisco, Calif. 1928.
- Mrs. GILBERT M. NICHOLS, Assonet, Mass. 1927.
- Dr. WILLIAM FREDERICK NOTZ, 5422 39th St., N. W., Washington, D. C. 1915.
- WILLIAM F. NUTT, M.D., Ph.D., Suite 1024, 17 North State St., Chicago, Ill. 1927.
- Dr. ALOIS RICHARD NYKL, 1401 Ridge Ave., Evanston, Ill. 1922.
- Prof. H. TH. OBBINK, D.D. (Univ. of Utrecht), Dillenburgstr. 29, Utrecht, Holland. 1928.
- Prof. JULIAN J. OBERMANN, Jewish Institute of Religion, 40 West 68th St., New York, N. Y. 1923.
- ADOLPH S. OCHS, The New York Times, New York, N. Y. 1921.
- Dr. FELIX, Freiherr von OEFELE, 326 East 58th St., New York, N. Y. 1913.
- HERBERT C. OETTINGER, Eighth and Walnut Sts., Cincinnati, Ohio. 1920.
- NAOYOSHI OGAWA, Bureau of Education, Government of Formosa, Taihoku, Formosa. 1921.
- Dr. CHARLES J. OGDEN, 628 West 114th St., New York, N. Y. 1906.
- Dr. ELLEN S. OGDEN, "Resthaven," R. F. D., Milford, Mass. 1898.
- Prof. SAMUEL G. OLIPHANT, Grove City College, Grove City, Pa. 1906.
- Prof. ALBERT TENEYCK OLMSTEAD, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1909.
- Prof. CHARLES A. OWEN, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. 1921.
- Pres. G. BROMLEY OXNAM, DePauw University, Greencastle, Ind. 1929.
- Dr. PAIR-MALL, Dhab Khatikan, Amritsar, India. 1929.
- Rabbi HERBERT PARZEN, Park and Clay Sts., Portland, Ore. 1929.
- ANTONIO M. PATERNO, 243 Aviles, Manila, P. I. 1922.
- Prof. LEWIS B. PATON, 359 Fern St., West Hartford, Conn. 1894.
- ROBERT LEET PATTERSON, 1703 Oliver Bldg., Pittsburgh, Pa. 1920.
- Pres. CHARLES T. PAUL, 63 Girard Ave., Hartford, Conn. 1921.
- ANTHONY F. PAURA, 1560 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1929.
- Dr. JAL DASTUR CURSETJI PAVEY, 43 Clarges St., London W. 1, England. 1921.

- CHARLES K. PAYNE, 1120 Kanawa St., Charleston, W. Va. 1927.
HAROLD PEIRCE, 222 Drexel Building, Philadelphia, Pa. 1920.
Rabbi WALTER G. PEISER, 1736 Olive St., Baton Rouge, La. 1928.
Prof. ISMAR J. PERITZ, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y. 1894.
Prof. MARSHALL LIVINGSTON PERRIN, Boston University, 688 Boylston St., Boston, Mass. 1921.
*Prof. EDWARD DELAVAN PERRY, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1879.
Dr. ARNOLD PESKIND, 2414 East 55th St., Cleveland, Ohio. 1920.
Rev. THEODORE C. PETERSEN, C.S.P., Ph.D., Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C. 1924.
Prof. WALTER PETERSEN (Univ. of Florida), 750 Franklin St., Gainesville Fla. 1909.
Dr. ROBERT HENRY PFEIFFER, S.T.M. (Harvard Univ.), 82 Larch Road, Cambridge, Mass. 1920.
Prof. DRYDEN L. PHELPS, 1800 Thousand Oaks Boulevard, Berkeley, Calif. 1929.
*Rev. Dr. DAVID PHILIPSON, 270 McGregor Ave., Cincinnati, Ohio. 1889.
Hon. WILLIAM PHILLIPS, North Beverly, Mass. 1917.
Rev. Dr. Z. B. T. PHILLIPS, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C. 1922.
Rev. WILLIAM TURNBULL PILTER, 122 Victoria Ave., Ore, Hastings, England. 1928.
Prof. K. RAMA PISHAROTI, Sanskrit College, Trippunithura, Cochin State, S. India. 1929.
Rev. MALCOLM S. PITT, 55 Rest Camp Road, Jubbulpore, C. P., India. 1925.
PAUL POPENOE, 2495 N. Marengo Ave., Altadena, Calif. 1914.
Rev. Dr. JOSEPH POPLICH, 113 Catawissa St., Mahanoy City, Pa. 1927.
Prof. WILLIAM POPPER (University of California), 529 The Alameda, Berkeley, Calif. 1897.
Prof. LUCIUS C. PORTER, Peking University, Peking, China. 1923.
Prof. D. V. POTDAR (New Poona College), 180 Shanvar Peth, Poona, India. 1921.
Prof. JAMES BISSETT PRATT, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. 1925.
Rev. Dr. SARTELL PRENTICE, 17 East 11th St., New York, N. Y. 1921.
*Prof. IRA M. PRICE, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1887.
*Hon. JOHN DYNELEY PRINCE (Columbia Univ.), American Legation, Belgrade, Yugoslavia. 1888.
FRANK H. PRITCHARD, M.D., Colton, Calif. 1929.
ARTHUR PROBSTHAIN, 41 Great Russell St., London W. C. 1, England. 1928.
Rev. Dr. A. H. PRUESSNER, c/o Methodist Mission, Medan, Sumatra. 1921.
MORRIS H. PULLIN, College of Religion, Butler University, Indianapolis, Ind. 1929.
Prof. CHARLES LYNN PYATT, The College of the Bible, Lexington, Ky. 1921 (1917).
Prof. GEORGE PAYN QUACKENBOS, Colonial Heights, Tuckahoe, N. Y. 1904.

- Prof. HAROLD S. QUIGLEY, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn. 1928.
- HEMENDEA K. RAKHIT, 500 Riverside Drive, New York, N. Y. 1926.
- G. RAMADAS, Sri Ramachandra Vilas, Jeypore, Vizagapatam, S. India. 1928.
- Dr. V. V. RAMANA-SASTRIN, Vedaraniam, Tanjore District, India. 1921.
- WILLIAM MADISON RANDALL, M. A., Kennedy School of Missions, 55 Elizabeth St., Hartford, Conn. 1926.
- MARCUS RAUH, 951 Penn Ave., Pittsburgh, Pa. 1920.
- Prof. JOHN H. RAVEN (New Brunswick Theol. Seminary), Bishop Place, New Brunswick, N. J. 1920.
- Pres. CASS ARTHUR REED, International College, Smyrna, Turkey. 1929.
- Prof. HARRY B. REED (Northwestern Lutheran Theol. Seminary), 1852 Polk St., N. E., Minneapolis, Minn. 1921.
- Rabbi SIDNEY L. REGNER, 40 North 11th St., Reading, Pa. 1928.
- Prof. NATHANIEL JULIUS REICH (Dropsie College), 309 North 33rd St. (Box 337), Philadelphia, Pa. 1923.
- Rabbi VICTOR E. REICHELT, Litt.D., Rockdale Avenue Temple, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1927.
- Dr. JOSEPH REIDER, Dropsie College, Philadelphia, Pa. 1913.
- JOHN REILLY, JR., American Numismatic Society, 156th St. and Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1918.
- Prof. AUGUST KARL REISCHAUER, Tokyo Joshi Daigaku, Iogimachi, Tokyo-fu, Japan. 1920.
- Rev. HILARY G. RICHARDSON, 147 North Broadway, Yonkers, N. Y. 1926.
- Prof. FRANK H. RIDGLEY, Lincoln University, Pa. 1929.
- Prof. EDWARD ROBERTSON, University College of North Wales, Bangor, Wales. 1921.
- Rev. Dr. CHARLES WELLINGTON ROBINSON, Christ Church, Bronxville, N. Y. 1916.
- Prof. DAVID M. ROBINSON, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1921.
- Prof. DOROTHY B. ROBINSON, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass. 1929.
- Prof. GEORGE LIVINGSTON ROBINSON (Presbyterian Theol. Seminary), 2312 North Halsted St., Chicago, Ill. 1892.
- Rev. Dr. THEODORE H. ROBINSON, University College, Cardiff, Wales. 1922.
- GEORGE N. ROERICH, Roerich Museum, 310 Riverside Drive, New York, N. Y. 1922.
- Prof. NICHOLAS ROERICH, Roerich Museum, 310 Riverside Drive, New York, N. Y. 1928.
- Mrs. ROSS W. ROGERS (*née* Henkel), 508 Park Ave., Mansfield, Ohio. 1928.
- Prof. JAMES HARDY ROPES (Harvard Univ.), 13 Follen St., Cambridge, Mass. 1893.
- Prof. WILLIAM ROSENAU, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1897.
- Dr. SAMUEL ROSENBLATT, 3507 Springdale Ave., Baltimore, Md. 1929.

- *JULIUS ROSENWALD, Ravinia, Ill. 1920.
LESSING J. ROSENWALD, care of Sears, Roebuck and Co., Philadelphia, Pa. 1924.
Prof. MICHAEL I. ROSTOVITZ (Yale Univ.), 1916 Yale Station, New Haven, Conn. 1926.
SAMUEL ROTHENBERG, M.D., 22 West 7th St., Cincinnati, Ohio. 1921.
AMIN ROUSTEM, Egyptian Consulate, 103 Park Ave., New York, N. Y. 1928.
Prof. GEORGE ROWLEY, Graduate College, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1926.
Miss ADELAIDE RUDOLPH, 401 West 118th St., New York, N. Y. 1894.
Prof. ELBERT RUSSELL, Duke University, Durham, N. C. 1916.
Dr. NAJEEB M. SALEEBY, P. O. Box 226, Manila, P. I. 1922.
Rev. FRANK K. SANDERS, Ph.D., Marmion Way, Rockport, Mass. 1897.
Prof. HENRY A. SANDERS, American Academy in Rome, Porta S. Pancrazio, Rome, Italy. 1924.
Rabbi NACHMAN SARNOFF, 1655 Park Boulevard, Camden, N. J. 1929.
Mrs. A. H. SAUNDERS, 552 Riverside Drive, New York, N. Y. 1915.
Prof. KENNETH J. SAUNDERS (Pacific School of Religion), High Acres, Creston Road, Berkeley, Calif. 1924.
Prof. HENRY SCHAEFFER (Lutheran Theol. Seminary), 1606 South 11th Ave., Maywood, Chicago, Ill. 1916.
Dr. ISRAEL SCHAPIRO, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C. 1914.
Dr. A. ARTHUR SCHILLER, 2101 Myra Court, Brooklyn, N. Y. 1927.
JOHN F. SCHLICHTING, 36 Grenfell Ave., Kew Gardens, N. Y. 1920.
MALCOLM B. SCHLOSS, 114 East 57th St., New York, N. Y. 1928.
Prof. NATHANIEL SCHMIDT, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. 1894.
ADOLPH SCHOENFELD, 69 East 108th St., New York, N. Y. 1921.
WILFRED H. SCHOFF, The Commercial Museum, Philadelphia, Pa. 1912.
Rev. Dr. SAMUEL SCHULMAN, 27 West 72nd St., New York, N. Y. 1928.
Rabbi JOSEPH J. SCHWARTZ, c/o American School of Oriental Research, Jerusalem, Palestine. 1925.
JULIUS SCHWARZ, 238 W. Penn St., Long Beach, N. Y. 1929.
WILLIAM BACON SCOTFIELD, Worcester Club, Worcester, Mass. 1919.
Prof. GILBERT CAMPBELL SCOGGIN, The Gennadeion, Athens, Greece. 1906.
Prof. FRED NEWTON SCOTT, 1741 East 4th St., Tucson, Ariz. 1929.
C. RANDOLPH JEFFERSON SCOTT, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1925.
*Mrs. SAMUEL BRYAN SCOTT (*née* Morris), St. Martin's Lane and Willow Grove Ave., Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia, Pa. 1903.
Rev. KEITH C. SEELE, 648 Milwaukee Ave., Elkhart, Ind. 1926.
SAMUEL M. SEGAL, 4750 North 7th St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1928.
Dr. MOSES SEIDEL, 22 North Broadway, Baltimore, Md. 1917.
Rev. Dr. WILLIAM G. SEIPLE, 125 Tsuchidoi, Sendai, Miyagi Ken, Japan. 1902.
Prof. O. R. SELLERS (Presbyterian Theol. Seminary), 846 Chalmers Place, Chicago, Ill. 1917.

- Prof. W. T. SEMPLE (Univ. of Cincinnati), 315 Pike St., Cincinnati, Ohio. 1928.
- Dr. VICTOR N. SHARENKOFF, 241 Princeton Ave., Jersey City, N. J. 1922.
- Prof. SRI RAM SHARMA, Dayanand Anglo-Vedic College, Lahore, India. 1926.
- Prof. BHAGABAT KUMAR GOSWAMI SHASTRI, Ph.D. (Gourgopinath Temple), 28 Bonomali Sircar St., Kumartuli, Calcutta, India. 1926.
- G. HOWLAND SHAW, Department of State, Washington, D. C. 1921.
- *Dr. T. LESLIE SHEAR, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1923.
- Rev. Dr. WILLIAM G. SHELLABEAR, 20 Whitman Ave., West Hartford, Conn. 1919.
- Prof. CHARLES N. SHEPARD (General Theol. Seminary), 9 Chelsea Square, New York, N. Y. 1907.
- ANDREW R. SHERRIFF, 527 Deming Place, N. S., Chicago, Ill. 1921.
- Dr. JOHN KNIGHT SHRYOCK (Univ. of Pennsylvania), 4509 Regent St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1922.
- DON CAMERON SHUMAKER, Y. M. C. A., University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa. 1922.
- Prof. S. MOHAMMAD SIBTAIN, Government College, Ludhiana, Punjab, India. 1926.
- Rev. ARTHUR R. SIEBENS, 102 Boulevard Arago, Paris, France. 1926.
- Rabbi JULIUS L. SIEGEL, 1533 S. St. Louis Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1925.
- Rev. REINHARD P. SIEVING, 801 DeMun Ave., St. Louis, Mo. 1927.
- Rabbi ABBA HILLEL SILVER, D.D., The Temple, East 105th St. at Ansel Road, Cleveland, Ohio. 1920.
- Dr. SOLOMON L. SKOSS, Dropsie College, Broad and York Sts., Philadelphia, Pa. 1926.
- Prof. S. B. SLACK, 17 Barton Crescent, Dawlish, Devon, England. 1921.
- *JOHN R. SLATTERY, 47 Avenue de l'Opéra, Paris, France. 1903.
- C. H. SMILEY, 5827 Maryland Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1929.
- Rev. H. FRAMER SMITH, 153 Institute Place, Chicago, Ill. 1922.
- Prof. J. M. POWIS SMITH, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1906.
- Prof. LOUISE P. SMITH, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. 1918.
- Dr. MARIA WILKINS SMITH (Temple Univ.), 1527 Spruce St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1928.
- WILLIAM C. SMITH, 1021 Grevelia St., South Pasadena, Calif. 1928.
- Rabbi ELIAS L. SOLOMON, D.H.L., 302 West 87th St., New York, N. Y. 1921.
- Prof. E. A. SPEISER, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1925.
- Rabbi LEON SPITZ, 830 Hudson St., Hoboken, N. J. 1925.
- Rev. H. HENRY SPOER, Ph. D., 25-40 Thirtieth Road, Astoria, Long Island, N. Y. 1926 (1899).
- Prof. MARTIN SPRENGLING, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1929 (1912).
- JOHN FRANKLIN SPRINGER, 618 West 136th St., New York, N. Y. 1921.
- Baron A. VON STAEL-HOLSTEIN, ex-Austrian Legation, Peiping, China. 1929.

- Dr. W. E. STAPLES, Box 113, Haifa, Palestine. 1927.
- Rev. Dr. THOMAS STENHOUSE, Mickley Vicarage, Stocksfield-on-Tyne, England. 1921.
- Prof. FERRIS J. STEPHENS, Babylonian Collection, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. 1925.
- Rabbi HARRY J. STERN, 4128 Sherbrooke St. West, Westmount, Montreal, Canada. 1928.
- HORACE STERN, 1524 North 16th St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.
- ISRAEL STIEFEL, 5454 Berks St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1929.
- J. FRANK STIMSON (Bernice P. Bishop Museum), Papeete, Tahiti, French Oceania. 1928.
- WILLIAM B. STIMSON, 1920 Panama St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1928.
- Rev. Dr. ANSON PHELPS STOKES, 2408 Massachusetts Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. 1900.
- Rev. Dr. JOSEPH STOLZ, 5010 Drexel Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. 1917.
- Prof. FREDERICK AMES STUFF (Univ. of Nebraska), Station A 1263, Lincoln, Neb. 1921.
- Prof. EDGAR HOWARD STURTEVANT (Yale Univ.), 1849 Yale Station, New Haven, Conn. 1924.
- Dr. W. F. STUTTERHEIM, Soerakarta, Java, Dutch East Indies. 1929.
- Dr. VISHNU S. SUKTHANKAR, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, P. O. Deccan Gymkhana, Poona City, India. 1921.
- Prof. LEO SUPPAN (St. Louis College of Pharmacy), 3540 Pestalozzi St., St. Louis, Mo. 1920.
- Pres. GEORGE SVERDRUP, Augsburg Seminary, Minneapolis, Minn. 1907.
- Prof. MARY HAMILTON SWINDLER, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 1929.
- SEYED AHMAD KASRAWI TABRIZI, Teheran, Persia. 1929.
- Prof. ROLLIN H. TANNER, New York University, University Heights, New York, N. Y. 1929.
- Rev. CHARLES LINCOLN TAYLOR, JR., 99 Brattle St., Cambridge, Mass. 1926.
- Prof. WILLIAM R. TAYLOR, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ont., Canada. 1925.
- Dr. CHAIM TCHERNOWITZ (Jewish Inst. of Religion), 435 Convent Ave., New York, N. Y. 1928.
- Rabbi SIDNEY S. TEDESCH, Ph.D., Union Temple, Brooklyn, N. Y. 1925 (1916).
- Rev. PATRICK J. TEMPLE, S.T.D., 104 Mount Joy Place, New Rochelle, N. Y. 1928.
- Sir RICHARD CARNAC TEMPLE, Baronet, c/o Lloyds Bank Ltd., 6 Pall Mall, London S. W. 1, England. 1928.
- NAINSINH THAKAR, 5719 Eighteenth Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y. 1923.
- Rev. Dr. GRIFFITHS W. THATCHER, Camden College, Hereford St., Glebe, N. S. W., Australia. 1926.
- Prof. ELBERT DUNCAN THOMAS, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah. 1926.

- EBEN FRANCIS THOMPSON, 311 Main St., Worcester, Mass. 1906.
- Rev. WILLIAM GORDON THOMPSON, St. Alban's Church, Highbridge, New York, N. Y. 1921.
- Dr. WILLIAM THOMPSON (Harvard Univ.), 32 Linnaean St., Cambridge, Mass. 1925.
- Rev. MONTGOMERY H. THROOP, St. John's University, Shanghai, China. 1928.
- *Prof. CHARLES C. TORREY, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. 1891.
- I. NEWTON TRAGER, 944 Marion Ave., Avondale, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1920.
- Prof. HAROLD H. TRYON, Union Theological Seminary, 3041 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1921.
- Prof. RUDOLF TSCHUDI, Ph.D., Benkenstrasse 61, Basle, Switzerland. 1923.
- JOSEPH A. V. TURCK, 522 Linden Ave., Wilmette, Ill. 1926.
- Rabbi JACOB TURNER, 4167 Ogden Ave., Hawthorne Station, Chicago, Ill. 1921.
- EDWIN H. TUTTLE, The Sunbury, apt. 405, 1212 M St., N. W., Washington, D. C. 1925.
- *Rev. Dr. LEMON LEANDER UHL, The Canterbury, 14 Charlesgate West, Boston, Mass. 1921.
- Rabbi SIDNEY E. UNGER, 615 N. Broad St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1929.
- Rev. SYDNEY N. USSHER, 44 East 76th St., New York, N. Y. 1909.
- M. USSISHKIN, P. O. Box 150, Jerusalem, Palestine. 1928.
- Dr. FELIX VÁLYI, c/o Lotos Club, 110 West 57th St., New York, N. Y. 1929.
- Dr. N. D. VAN LEEUWEN, Engelsche Straat 47, Leeuwarden, Holland. 1928.
- Rev. MAURICIO VANOEVERBERGH, Kabugaw-Apayaw, Mountain Province, P. I. 1921.
- Prof. ARTHUR A. VASCHALDE, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C. 1915.
- LUDWIG VOGELSTEIN, 61 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1920.
- Prof. EDWIN E. VOIGT, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill. 1925.
- Dr. PAUL VONWILLER (Univ. of Zurich), Frohburgstr. 69, Zurich, Switzerland. 1928.
- Dr. J. D. L. DE VRIES, 11 Jac. Catsstraat, Utrecht, Holland. 1927.
- Dean LEE VROOMAN, International College, Smyrna, Turkey. 1929.
- Prof. JAKOB WACKERNAGEL (Univ. of Basle), Gartenstr. 93, Basle, Switzerland. 1921.
- Mrs. SOPHIE CAMACHO WADIA, "Guru Mandir," Ootacamund (Nilgiris, Madras Pres.), S. India. 1927.
- *FELIX M. WARBURG, 52 William St., New York, N. Y. 1921.
- Mrs. EDITH WILLIAMS WARE, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1928.
- JAMES R. WARE, c/o American University Union, 173 Boulevard St. Germain, Paris, France. 1923.
- Prof. O. W. WARMINGHAM (Boston Univ.), 107 University Road, Brookline, Mass. 1928.
- †Prof. WILLIAM F. WARREN (Boston Univ.), 131 Davis Ave., Brookline, Mass. 1877.

- Prof. LEROY WATERMAN, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1912.
- Dr. MEYER WAXMAN, 3225 Douglas Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. 1929.
- *Dr. THOMAS WEARING, 192 Oxford St., Rochester, N. Y. 1927.
- *Prof. HUTTON WEBSTER (Univ. of Nebraska), Station A, Lincoln, Neb. 1921.
- Dr. BARUCH WEITZEL, 4269 Leidy Ave., Philadelphia, Pa. 1926.
- HENEY S. WELLCOME, Director, Wellcome Historical Medical Museum, 54A Wigmore St., London W. 1, England. 1928.
- Prof. GORDON B. WELLMAN (Wellesley College), 17 Midland Road, Wellesley, Mass. 1928.
- ARCHIBALD GIBSON WENLEY, 364 Karasu-maru-dori, Demizu Agar, Kyoto, Japan. 1925.
- Rev. O. V. WERNER, c/o R. C. Werner, 1507 Metropolitan Ave., Ridgewood, L. I., N. Y. 1921.
- ARTHUR J. WESTERMAYR, 14 John St., New York, N. Y. 1912.
- Mrs. JAMES SMITH WHITE, Kemper Lane Apts., Cincinnati, Ohio. 1929.
- Miss VIOLA WHITE, International School of Vedic and Allied Research, Times Building, 1475 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1928.
- Pres. WILBERT W. WHITE, D. D., The Biblical Seminary in New York, 235 East 49th St., New York, N. Y. 1921.
- *Miss MARGARET DWIGHT WHITNEY, 186 Edwards St., New Haven, Conn. 1908.
- WILLIAM B. WHITNEY, J.D., 1 West 54th St., New York, N. Y. 1929.
- PERCIVAL W. WHITTLESEY, M.A., Highmount Ave., Nyack, N. Y. 1926.
- *Miss CAROLYN M. WICKER, care of Rierison Library Art Institute, Chicago, Ill. 1921.
- Prof. ALBAN G. WIDGERY, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. 1929.
- Prof. LEO WIENER (Harvard Univ.), 50 Buckingham St., Cambridge, Mass. 1928.
- PETER WIERNIK, 930 Eastern Parkway, Brooklyn, N. Y. 1920.
- MOSE WILBUSHIEWICH, Haifa, Palestine. 1928.
- HERMAN WILE, 566 Richmond Ave., Buffalo, N. Y. 1920.
- Rev. A. L. WILEY, Ph.D., Ratnagiri, India. 1926.
- Pres. ERNEST HATCH WILKINS, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio. 1928.
- HIRAM PARKES WILKINSON, M.A., Drumballyhagan, Tobermore, Co. Derry, N. Ireland. 1928.
- Prof. HERBERT L. WILLETT (Univ. of Chicago), 319 Richmond Road, Kenilworth, Ill. 1917.
- Mrs. CAROLINE RANSOM WILLIAMS (Univ. of Michigan), The Chesbrough Dwellings, Toledo, Ohio. 1912.
- *Hon. EDWARD T. WILLIAMS, 1412 Scenic Ave., Berkeley, Calif. 1901.
- Mrs. FREDERICK WELLS WILLIAMS, 155 Whitney Ave., New Haven, Conn. 1918.
- JOHN A. WILSON, care of American Express Co., Opera House, Cairo, Egypt. 1924.
- Dr. OLIVE M. WINCHESTER, 604 14th Ave., S., Nampa, Idaho. 1929.
- HERBERT E. WINLOCK, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, N. Y. 1919.

- Rev. Dr. STEPHEN S. WISE, 23 West 90th St., New York, N. Y. 1894.
 Prof. JOHN E. WISHART, San Francisco Theological Seminary, San Anselmo, Calif. 1911.
 Rev. ADOLF LOUIS WISMAR, Ph.D., 419 West 145th St., New York, N. Y. 1922.
 Dr. UNRAI WOGIHARA, 595 Ta-ma-mura, Kita-ta-ma-gun, Tokyo-fu, Japan. 1921.
 Prof. LOUIS B. WOLFENSON, 37 University Road, Brookline, Mass. 1904.
 Prof. HARRY A. WOLFSON (Harvard Univ.), 35 Divinity Hall, Cambridge, Mass. 1917.
 Rabbi LOUIS WOLSEY, 1400 Jefferson St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1926.
 FRANK ELMER WOOD, 5744 Kenwood Ave., Hyde Park, Chicago, Ill. 1929.
 Dr. FREDERICK T. WOOD, 241 Merion Road, Merion, Pa. 1927.
 HOWLAND WOOD, Curator, American Numismatic Society, 156th St. and Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1919.
 Prof. IRVING F. WOOD (Smith College), Northampton, Mass. 1905.
 Prof. WILLIAM H. WOOD (Dartmouth College), 3 Clement Road, Hanover, N. H. 1917.
 Dr. ANGUS S. WOODBURN, Babbington Garden Road, Madras, India. 1926.
 Prof. JAMES H. WOODS (Harvard Univ.), 29 Follen St., Cambridge, Mass. 1900.
 Prof. ALFRED COOPER WOOLNER, M.A. (University of the Punjab), 53 Lawrence Road, Lahore, India. 1921.
 E. C. WORMAN, 5 Russell St., Calcutta, India. 1926.
 Prof. W. H. WORRELL, Angell Hall, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1928 (1910).
 Prof. JESSE ERWIN WRENCH (Univ. of Missouri), 1104 Hudson Ave., Columbia, Mo. 1917.
 Rev. HORACE K. WRIGHT, Ahmednagar, India. 1921.
 Prof. MARTIN J. WYNGAARDEN (Calvin College and Theol. Seminary), 1116 Bates St., S. E., Grand Rapids, Mich. 1924.
 HANAN YARDEN, 402 Sixth St., Vineland, N. J. 1929.
 Dr. DAVID YELLIN (Hebrew Univ. of Jerusalem), P. O. Box 128, Jerusalem, Palestine. 1928.
 Prof. ROYDEN KEITH YERKES (Philadelphia Divinity School), Box 247, Merion, Pa. 1916.
 Prof. MOHAMMED HAIMIDULLAH KHAN YOSE, Government College, Ajmer, Rajputana, India. 1926.
 Prof. HERRICK B. YOUNG, American College, Teheran, Persia. 1928.
 Prof. SOLOMON ZETTLIN, Dropsie College, Broad and York Sts., Philadelphia, Pa. 1926.
 Rev. ROBERT ZIMMERMAN, S.J., St. Xavier's College, Cruickshank Road, Bombay, India. 1911.
 Rev. Dr. SAMUEL M. ZWEMER, care of American Mission, Cairo, Egypt. 1920.

[Total: 762]

(60 200)

1

12. ✓ 82

